FEB 4 1957

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Dr. C. W. Brewbaker

2,50

C. W. Brewbaker

THE SOCIAL AIMS OF JESUS

THE SOCIAL AIMS OF JESUS

BY

CHARLES HENRY DICKINSON

AUTHOR OF "THE CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION OF MODERN LIFE" AND "THE RELIGION OF THE SOCIAL PASSION"

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BS
2417
.S7
D25
1930
38,230

RICHARD R. SMITH, INC.
NEW YORK
1930

Copyright, 1930, by
RICHARD R. SMITH, INC.

All rights reserved

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To
THE MEMORY OF MY WIFE
MARY LORD THORN DICKINSON

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
FEB 4 1957

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/socialaimsofjesu0000char

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	The Leadership of Jesus	1
II	The Social Necessity of New Testament Criticism	12
III	The Course of the Tradition	36
IV	Through the Mists	57
V	Sources and Gospels	80
VI	Jesus the Jew	102
VII	Jesus and Israel's Law	121
VIII	Jesus and Israel's Hope	139
IX	Jesus' Religion of the Father's Will	164
X	Jesus' Realization of the Father's Will	186
XI	World and Soul	210
XII	Jesus' Creative Fulfilments of Humanity	234
XIII	Jesus' Creative Fulfilments of Our Time	263
XIV	The Eternal Immanences	292

THE SOCIAL AIMS OF JESUS

CHAPTER I

THE LEADERSHIP OF JESUS

I

The supreme leader of humanity had compassion on the multitude because they were as sheep without a shepherd. The aimlessness of human life was pitiable to him, in every man who does not achieve himself in aims inclusive of all his powers, and without which efforts lack meaning and value. In this aimlessness, humanity, through the ages of its gropings and wanderings, is not a social unity, but a multitude distressed and scattered. To every man's personal and social life, and to humanity which he desired to make one flock, guided by one shepherd, he offers his leadership, which is the world's salvation.

There is growing in the world a perception that one has been here who knew what it is all for, and how to combine the essentials of human life in his sufficient aims. There is the inquiry whether the religion which he taught and lived, if we can recover it and him may not be the energizing leadership, social no less than personal. If this be so we are not relieved of the labour, ever new and urgent, of working out the world's ever new tasks and problems: we are brought to an endeavour which is not impossible.

Requisite for the acceptance of his leadership are repentance and humility. There is abundant reason for them. Our generation has made bad work of its world. Because achievements in wealth and power and knowledge had no unifying purpose they plunged the world into immeasurable confusion. Present efforts at rehabilitation

lack directive aims clear enough and inclusive enough to avert catastrophe and to ensure progress. Recent events and continuing conditions, colossal failures and the evident incompleteness and uncertainty of our successes, force upon us appalling questions: How far can social evolution advance? How permanent are its attainments? How strong are its defences against unsocial forces? The sufficient answer is in better aims than the world has yet discerned.

II

Against desperate situations, disastrous tendencies, rises the disclosure of humanity's recuperative powers. Never after a universal catastrophe have they worked with greater energy than they are working now. They produce over considerable areas improvements that are capable of further extensions. It is felt that these energies must be directed along better aims than those which issued in the world's vast miseries. A brief reference to one of the most important of these movements may intimate what will be developed more fundamentally in later chapters: its implications of the aims of Jesus, its fulfilments by Jesus' aims.

From the heroism and the brutishness, the devotions and debasements of war, we looked with hopeful admiration to the common toils of men. While armies wore one another down, peasant and workman fought the stern battle for life's necessities, for conditions in which mankind might continue its existence. An enormous part of their labour was lost, wasted, destroyed or made destructive. Then and since, against desperate dislocations and confusions men have toiled on through hunger and disease, with reconstructive energies beyond any expectation and any praise. Against spoliations, individual ambitions, international hates, political chicanery, immoral stupidity in high places, have risen the strength and wisdom of the

world's indefatigable toil. Judicious and noble designs for restoration of the world are based upon these labours and directed to their efficiency.

Recovery and progress through men's daily toils have now an ally which manifolds them and offers richer rewards of comforts, amenities and cultures, and their distributions, far beyond anything that men could previously hope for. The applications of science, in field and factory, in earth and sea and air, in production and distribution, bring mankind to the prospect of a new world. Science's love of truth is fulfilling itself in earnestness to serve. Even in the transformation of our conceptions of the universe and its constituents, scientific discovery produces scientific invention, and the most abstract mathematic applies itself to combat some enemy of man and to create some human good. No attainments of science are too majestic to serve humblest needs. Its most practical ministry whereby are wrought in largest measure its contributions to health, comfort, the joys of life and their diffusions, is in the scientific organization of industry, which includes administration, distribution, finance, along with productive processes.

It may be said here in passing, in anticipation of a later chapter, that no reason has yet appeared for the supposition that production in general will outstrip the needs of men, thus permanently aggravating the miseries of unemployment. What limit is there to human enjoyments and the worths of life? What contributions to human welfare can exceed its possibilities of expansion? And ample supply of men's needs removes the pressure for long hours of drudgery which leave neither time, opportunity nor vigour for the goods of life.

There is involved in this advance the prospect of an improved social order, attained by processes not destructive but constructive, not revolutionary but evolutionary,

based not upon theory but upon achievement. In fortunate places stupendous gains in wealth and in the instruments of its rapid accumulation are widely diffused gains. They are bringing that ampler recompense for common toil which progressively creates demands for increasing production. They open the way for the workers into ownership, which involves participation in administration. In this process the intolerable distinction between the capitalistic class and the proletariate becomes fainter, with hope of obliteration, not through conflict but by a co-operation that blends. It will not seem necessary to reduce capitalists to the status of proletarians—an obsolescent word—when the proletarian can be raised to the status of the capitalist. The resultant order is not capitalism in the old exclusive, antagonistic connotations. Whatever in it is usable for these universal human purposes is vindicated in them. Its class consciousness, world-wide exploitations, inhuman crimes, though they seem ineradicable are antiquated. Though what is developing is not socialism according to antique formulas, yet noble socialistic goals are being approached without impracticable methods and repressions of initiative, while co-operations and benefits are conserved, with an open field for experiment and development. The resultant social order will some day be christened with a new name. In this process there is extension of education, of the amenities and vigours of life. Opportunities to develop powers of service, including the highest and finest, are opening to multitudes no longer oppressed by poverty and enforced ignorance. Vast floods of wealth for humanity, material, cultural, spiritual, are unsealed. The equalizing of opportunity for all is an essential of this process. The way into larger life is widening. Even for subnormal bodies and minds there is promise of restoration and participation.

The good sense of the world looks for recovery and advance to the scientific organization of men's common toils. It is not only physical science which is demanded for this efficiency. The word organization is chosen as indicating the scope of the movement and its opportunities for every function in its development. Here manipulations give place to creations.

This stage of economic evolution is in its beginnings. It must not be underestimated because of defects inevitable to beginnings. Behind it are mighty propulsions and before it is an immense field. Though many nations suffer repressions of poverty which make all but impossible a life worth living, with long agonies of enforced idleness, with inadequate pay for labour that contains no joyous unfoldings of the higher human powers, and beneath the poverty of occidental lands there is the unfathomable hunger and squalor of the Orient, yet the scientific organization of industry is generally applicable, even to remote lands and to climes apparently intractable, which may find in the advance their share and function.

Because the movement is in its beginnings it is in peculiar peril. The worst enemy is the greed that can be called capitalistic, because capital has used and still uses concentrated power to inflict greed's enormous crimes against the defenceless, and has fought a desperate losing battle with industrial democracy. This spirit, not limited to capital, may persist in the scientific organization of industry, which then both opens itself to destructive influences and also forms them within itself. Its way of salvation is to find the aims which are the fulfilments of its own implications.

It is inevitable that this advance should encounter many repulses, misfortunes, depressions, confusions, make many mistakes, develop ills of its own. There will be dark periods, some of them almost desperate. It is opposed by

unfavorable conditions, and future situations will unfold new difficulties. Every advance is a conflict, with danger of defeat and failure.

Many of the imminent perils belong to a past that is becoming weaker. Growing resistance to them meets their decreasing power. Sovietism is rejected by the workers of nations in which the greater movement has begun, even in lands of its slight beginnings, because the soviet system is recognized as out of date. There are dangers from aggressive nationalism, but such nationalism is now irrelevant to the labours that nations have to accomplish with reference to one another. Racial antipathies are anachronisms. They reduce to difficult but adjustable economic questions. Lust of conquest has less appeal now that its futile destructiveness to both victor and vanquished is evident. Exploitations of feeble and backward peoples are seen to be impoverishments of powers needed in the world-wide partnership. A similar judgment falls upon restrictions of international communications and co-operations. Mischievous appeals that inflamed the nations such a little while ago cannot speak the language of present interests. Political considerations, national and international, are impertinent except as they regard and serve the advancing construction of human work. Incongruous and antiquated are war and preparations for war, with their hindrances and burdens upon the work that men have to do. Necessary to the ending of war is a common rational interest for mankind, for all sorts and conditions of men, every grade of character and intelligence. This means the reign of international law, the fellowship of the nations, and instruments for the effectiveness of that fellowship. The chief of these instruments is man's work, to whose furtherance the others are the means. Whoever introduces into a nation or develops in it the scientific efficiency of industry accomplishes that

which political and judicial measures have but to confirm. The requisites for peace can be undertaken with the best hopes of success within the efficiencies and organizations of the world's daily labours.

To any who are disposed to depreciate this movement as economic and material, and to compare with it to its disparagement those historic phases whose passion was thought or beauty or devotion to a great cause, two discriminative reflections are commended. The first, that this impulse is not identical with the craving for individual wealth and the power which it grasps, nor with the concentrated ownership of capital: this is rather for the diffused ownership of capital. Those prodigious evils within nations and among nations which are branded as commercialism are due to the effort from which this must be distinguished, whatever the evils present or implicit in it. The nature of this movement is social, its inclusions are universal.

And is that power unideal which is directed, and with an increasing consciousness, by a practicable method, to a larger life for mankind? Was the Greek spirit more ideal which based culture upon a system of slavery? Or the genius of the Renaissance whose sunkissed heights threw their shadows across the valley? Such endeavours failed of the high purpose of attaining a good which is universal. There have indeed been historic movements of a truly spiritual because universal tendency, and this characteristic of our time is to be ranked among them. Its commitment to the work of laying the foundations of values, of tilling the soil upon which plants of life may grow, is an essentially ideal task. All the more necessary because of its practical undertakings are the recognition of its implicit nature and the development, against many oppositions both within and from without, of that which its spirit demands.

The universal distribution of greatly increased goods and powers by a definite, concrete, practical method which has proved its effectiveness,—this is a distinctive purpose of our time. It is not yet achievement but arduous task, unremitting conflict against many adversaries.

Repeatedly in the experience of mankind, the dawn of a great hope, such as the inauguration of the Pax Romana, has been darkened because men did not know by what aims their achievements should be governed. If the present movement works itself out successfully there will be found in it, as in other great attainments the seeds of new evils and recrudescences of former ills. Every improvement furnishes exploitations to the devastators of the world. An advantage gained by one section of mankind may be used against other sections which destructively retaliate. The more plentiful the provender the greedier the swine. Things increase faster than the knowledge of their use. Old sanctions become inapplicable and new sanctions for new conditions form slowly and experimentally. Unexpected complications arise without experience to cope with them. Interests clash in novel ways and men align themselves against one another in fresh emulations and passions. Acquisition tempts to self-indulgence, vice, degeneracy. The onward march may become circular. Even if our economic hopes are largely realized these are but the means of life. Many who possess them are no better off for them. A prosperous world might be an unhappy world. Men's boast that they are rich and increased in goods and have need of nothing betrays that they are wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked. Social advantages no less than social disasters affirm the necessity of the sufficient social aims, to safeguard and fulfil.

The secular advance is attended by one which is more directly spiritual. Its noblest manifestation is the dis-

satisfaction of the Christian who really lives in this time, with a merely individual salvation, though it be the salvation of great multitudes of individuals. And far beyond the circle of those who call themselves Christians extends the deepening consciousness of social personality as received from and imparted to a world of men, in the conviction that no man lives a human life save as he forms himself and fulfils himself in the tasks which men do together. This conviction is the root of the social passion which, against many adversaries, is the significant quality of our time.

But the advantages which are being gained are so largely material that the satisfaction in them which threatens may engulf the cultural gains, and the social passion itself be content on life's lower ranges. And again the appalling questions will confront men concerning the strength of these achievements to resist unsocial forces.

III

There might seem to be little occasion for another pen to be added to the many which exhort the social impulse of our time to seek guidance and inspiration from the man of Nazareth. But in the field where the labourers are so many there is a plot that has not been cultivated too intensively: there has not been a superfluity of constructive considerations of a fundamental question pertaining to social Christianity. It is the question whether Jesus really has a social gospel, receivable by the social impulse of our time and responsive to our urgent social tasks,—whether he meets us at the place which the vanguard of the human race has attained in the long and devious march toward humanity, that he may lead us on. The contributions of New Testament criticism are indispensable to the inquiry.

This question is surely important for the work of evan-

gelizing the world with a social gospel learned from him. For though the whole world should be persuaded to accept a social guidance hallowed by his name, just that acceptance would issue in a more conscious rejection of him if he is found insufficiently constructive for practical social tasks. And what did he know, or if he knew what did he tell, of political and economic principles and their physical conditions? What recognition had the arts from him? That essential repudiation of the world of human affairs which characterizes his earliest followers, which is read in the New Testament, which is attributed to him in gospel passages, was it indeed his? If so, the very impulse that turns to him would be compelled to turn away and walk with him no more.

Then the personal relation to Christ would be more difficult, in the growing conviction that the time for accepting Christ as the saviour of the soul individualistically conceived is past for every man who has work to do. And a Christ who is limited to the more immediate relations of person to person is not the supreme Lord of those who are conscious of the inclusive organizations, and the necessary relations of every life to them. For all the advances of humanity converge in the social passion and the social passion turns to Christ. What fatal confusions if he is found not to be the Christ of the social passion!

It is necessary then, if we are to hope for a social Christianity and an actual Christendom, that we do these two things: ascertain what Christ and his gospel were, and apply to Christ and his gospel every social test, whatever comes of it. An old love song expresses a universal principle of thought and action:

> "He either fears his fate too much,
> Or his deserts are small,
> That dares not put it to the touch,
> To gain or lose it all."

There are two prominent reasons for buoyant confidence in this adventure. As we trust a great soul that has conquered in every one of its life's battles to be victorious when confronted by a new adversary however terrible, even though it be the ultimate terror, so we who have never found Christ to fail our souls in any crisis are confident that he will not fail us in anything that belongs to the task of the soul.

The second encouragement is, that the challenge of Christ's social sufficiency, as it has been formed by the severest scholarship and reflection of our time, contains a great affirmation. The superficial imputation to him of social conceptions of our time is rejected on the ground of his purely religious devotion, his completely spiritual aims, his emphasis upon personal salvation. This affirmation brings us to the most vital aspect of man's universal task, which is to achieve the spiritual interpretation of all objects of thought, to win the victory of the spirit subduing all things to itself. There may be discovered the synthesis of his kingdom, which is not of this world, with the organizations of the world. Our fearless adventure may so disclose in Jesus social completions of what we have attained that they will clarify our social confusions, unify our social divergencies. There may be revealed to us a meaning of humanity so far above men's present appreciations that all human powers can awake and combine for its glorious realization in his name. Supreme Leader, whither goest thou?—that thy world may toil thither following thee.

CHAPTER II

THE SOCIAL NECESSITY OF NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM

I

It is necessary to learn accurately what Jesus' aims were in order to direct human affairs to their accomplishment. The neglect of this obvious necessity has caused much mischief. In this work is involved a critically scientific examination of the records of his ministry, in every light that can be turned upon his career and himself. The moment we cease to hold an undiscriminating literalism which affirms that the gospels are infallible in every report and every detail, down to the cursing of the fig tree and the legion of devils in the swine, the task of critical examination and reconstruction is not only upon professional scholars, but for every man who desires the guidance of Jesus in all that men do together, in all the relations of men to one another.

This critically reconstructive work has great values for the inmost personal life, for the life of God in man's soul. But if Jesus has a social gospel (and may that assumption be permitted through this chapter, for demonstration later) the necessity of this work is more urgent for the life of God in man's world. There is a distinction, which can be only provisional and temporary, between that social task in Christ's kingdom which requires clear conceptions, and the inner personal life where vagueness is less harmful. Multitudes of Christians who have never dreamed of making distinctions in the gospel records have intuitively selected those deeds of Jesus which reveal to their souls the Father, those utterances which are words

of eternal life. Through wide ranges of influence their lives are beneficent and may be magnificently intense. And there are such souls so filled with the spirit of Jesus that in every relation of their lives Christ does his will and attains his purpose in them. Yet as the works of men pass on to increasingly complex interrelations there is increasing need of that accurate direction from Jesus' life and thought which men can act upon together. Else the unco-ordinated efforts of his disciples have a resultant which is a small part of the expended energy. For full power against hostile forces we must know what he commands us to do together, and this knowledge and the energies which it directs give clearness and power to the inmost personal life. Attainment of this knowledge involves discriminating examination of the records of Jesus' career. Dogmatic objections in the interest of undiscriminating literalism fade before the demand to know the mind of Jesus that we may continue the work of Jesus. The higher criticism of the New Testament is a social necessity.

The Protestant Reformation gave the Bible to the people, for the saving power of Christ in the inner life. That achievement must be completed in a generally diffused scientific knowledge of the Bible. Our time is bent upon imparting fundamental scientific principles to people generally, with scientific application to each man's affairs. If this endeavour succeeds it will be because there is imparted with no less thoroughness and no narrower diffusion, the accurate, discriminative knowledge of Christ's aims for all co-operant works and mutual relations of men.

There are limits to the time of busy people and few can attain trained expertness in this field. But that which men demand of themselves in other fields of effective living beyond their vocations can be matched in this. Few are accomplished in physical science; but all must acquire the scientific mind, that they may think in scientific proc-

esses and act in accord with things as they are. Many who lack the creative literary mind or the opportunity to develop it have enlarged and invigorated all they think and do by cultivating the discriminatively literary sense. Inexpert lovers of beauty thus attain artistic appreciation. Our civilization demands of all men the political mind. A workable knowledge of practical affairs is required of artists, scholars and writers. A man does not know his own work unless he knows it in its relations, and according to Christianity the leadership of Jesus is the supreme relation of all men's works. The meaning of that leadership we need to know, in the ways in which it can be known. Every religious teacher, ordained or unordained, can learn and impart. Every college and university can increase the number of those through whom this illumination is diffused. Expert scholarship must become expert leadership. Neither to scholar nor to priest can the thought and heart and power of Christ be an exclusive privilege.

The critical task which the social exigencies of our time lay upon the consciences of earnest people is not too difficult for those who lack technical training. Bernheim, in his book on historic method—an elaborate and authoritative treatise—while he stresses the demands upon the historic investigator almost beyond the limits of human capability, emphasizes no less strongly the principle that historic problems generally are of the same nature as those with which practical persons are concerned whenever in their affairs facts have to be determined and courses of action decided in view of the facts. Here is a difference between the qualifications demanded by mathematical science, or by physical science when involving mathematical processes, and those sciences which have to do with human action. In the former many who are otherwise intelligent may strive for the necessary ability with scant success. In the latter the methods reduce to those followed by

practical men and women in practical affairs. By their disciplined experience historic methods and their results are to be judged. There is an advantage over too cloistered scholarship, and the true scholar has regard for the intelligence trained in factory or field, in office or market place. The application to the study of Jesus is obvious.

There is required of us today, whether we are in the church or out of it, an attention to the religious urgencies of our time, which are now recognized as social, equal to that which the founders of our nation's life devoted to their own religious issues. They demanded instruction, not entertainment, from the pulpit, and were attentive to it however severe or protracted, and they reflected habitually upon the instruction. They read and pondered difficult religious books including the thorniest thickets of their Bibles. "They laid up these words in their hearts and in their souls. They taught them to their children. They talked of them when they sat in the house, and when they walked by the way, when they lay down and when they rose up. They meditated upon them on their beds." They found hours for prayerful reflection. Their recreation was to consider these things. They had the habit of thinking things through with God.

The excuse that we are too busy to follow their example is refuted by their harder work with longer hours of toil. They won real leisure because they inhibited our unprofitable and exhaustive dissipations. The excuse of a wider range of interests is the confession that we do not know what they are for. If we fail to include them in the supreme interest we lose the meaning of them and lose ourselves in them. Many plead that in "an age of specialization" they have all they can do in their own departments, or if they go beyond them it is to directly practical applications of them or to recreative avocations. But although a man can work in his specialty without regard to what

encircles it, he cannot live in his specialty unless he knows it in man's common task directed by the inclusive aims. Short of this we are aimless, superficial, fragmentary.

Though some subjects of their reflection are now antiquated, all moulded the concentrated mind, the unconcessive conscience, the discipline of doing and viewing all things in their supreme relations. Through the exercise of such powers mankind progresses in the unfoldings of spiritual reality for new tasks. In reverent appreciation of these men and women and children we leave behind us much that engaged them, and accept the unfolded tasks of serviceable action guided by spiritual thought which are brought to us from a world so much extended and so different. To remain in their views and to limit ourselves to their religious problems would be the opposite of their spirit. For they burst through the limitations of their time, broke away from traditions and conventions. They as thorough protestants, nonconformists, were iconoclasts, radicals, modernists, that they might accomplish the constructive work which the progress and need of humanity in their time demanded of them. This radically constructive enterprise their spirit requires of us. Indispensable in our inherited obligation is the work which is technically called the higher criticism, and untechnically that knowledge of Jesus whereby we can accomplish his work in our time.

Not all critical studies of the New Testament have been inspired by this evangelical motive. Contributions made without this motive may be used for the Christian purpose. Scholars who have experienced the length and breadth and depth and height of the love of Christ which passeth knowledge are impressed by the superiority of Jesus to the apprehensions of the evangelists. Unmistakable indications of this difference such investigators find evident throughout the gospels, which report words and

deeds that can be attributed to none less than Jesus himself, interspersed and commingled with accounts of actions and sayings of another quality. To discriminate in the gospels that which is his and that which is none of his and that which is his imperfectly and confusedly is their arduous task. They bring to it spiritual capacities and the severest historic and literary criticism. If their work succeeds its beneficent results for the life and faith of the future must be invaluable. And all along its course it radiates spiritual benefit. Some of the methods of their work cannot be manipulated by all, even as the techniques of secular science cannot be undertaken by all the world which it is organising. But as from the technical toil of scientists in other departments flow universal advantages, eminent among which is the scientific mind, so from the scholar's toil applied to the records of Jesus' life there are poured continually into the world clearer, deeper, regenerative inspirations of the inexhaustible riches of Christ. Therefore "beneath the written word we seek thee, Lord."

The effort is a tribute of love and loyalty to Jesus. When a great and holy soul commits its earthly mission to other hands, the heirs of the task spare no time and pains in accumulating and verifying everything in the earthly mission of that soul which may accomplish the legacy of its continued service in the world. We who have known and loved recall together the words and deeds, comparing our remembrances with patient, loyal care. We collect every writing and memorial. We learn those parts of the beneficent life which are outside our own memories and authenticate what is told us. From all these sifted materials we gather the unity of the sublime personality, the secret of its influence, so that the gracious ministry may be continued by our lives. Can we do less than this for our Lord?

II

Against such a study of Jesus an objection is urged to whose motive all respect is due. Its concern is for Christ's little ones, for youth's uncertainties, for simple people, for converts to Christianity in non-Christian lands, especially among undeveloped races. It is thought that the discriminations of New Testament science, often misrepresented and misunderstood, bring confusions into immature minds and weaken the foundations of their faith. Does that interpretation of the gospel which is addressed to the discriminative thought of our time put a stumbling-block in the way of the least of these?

Those who, like the writer, have served simple people, know that the intense simplicity of their faith is a moral and spiritual energy. Their teachers learn from them to receive the kingdom of God as a little child. But their literalistic dogmatism, a dogmatism based upon a crude literalism, is not simple. It is bewilderingly inconsequential. It encumbers morality and spirituality. The growth of intelligence brings to light its inconsistencies. The preservation of a simple faith which has such connections is imperiled in them and much more in their children.

The way to preserve this simple faith and to develop its spiritual life is a plain way. The pedagogical principle is accepted, that spiritual truth must be unfolded gradually to the growing capacity of spiritual intelligence, lest eyes be suddenly dazzled by excess of light, and the presentation of truth become error to those whom it bewilders. Nothing need be offered to the unschooled which is beyond their comprehension. Those teachings and acts of Jesus which criticism verifies prove to be the gospel for the simple. It is to the real Christ, who preached the gospel to the poor, that their thoughts and hearts and wills respond. In the task of leading them into the depths

and heights of this gospel there is no need of duplicity, nor of concealment of the fact that the knowledge of Christ unfolds broader thoughts continually. To emphasize that which historic science finds to be his emphasis and to relate to it those deeds and instructions of his which historic science authenticates,—this is the practical method for the instruction and training of simple people. That which is especially congenial to them is the social gospel of Jesus. They are the oppressed: to them is assigned the first place in Jesus' regard and they accept that which is their own. The Christ of the social passion fills their heart and life till there is no room for anything, from the evangelists' records or elsewhere, which is not of him. The real Christ, the historic Jesus, makes a difference in the faith of such men and in all faith that aspires to the simplicity of "these little ones which believe in me."

So may our children be taught of Jesus. It is the real Jesus to whom we must suffer the little children to come that he may take them in his arms, lay his hands upon them and bless them. Our method is in accordance with advances in the art of child nurture, the purpose of which is the development of social personality. Neither to the child in years nor to the undeveloped childishness of adult simple people need those legendary elements of the gospel story be omitted which incarnate spiritual reality in exquisite spontaneous forms. They require to be presented poetically that the imagination which receives them may have its part in the fulness of the spiritual life; and poetically, imaginatively the childlike mind receives them. Is there not a better way than to commit the delicate faith of a child to pious ignorance? Would it not be wiser, where a church's method of instructing its children continues the devastations of dogmatic literalism, to restore the function of religious teaching to enlightened father-

hood and motherhood, that the incapacity of a church may give opportunity to the spirituality of a home?

In the interest of youth and children the situation must be considered, that in universities, colleges, and technical schools, also in secondary schools, there are many whose loss of faith accompanied their repudiation of literalism. In other schools of life the same disaster may be observed. The emancipation of youth, which is among the significant symptoms of our time, is a demand for the sufficient leadership, for the real Christ.

Christianity's missionary opportunity, which is world-wide, finds its representatives irresolute whether to declare the real Christ, the religion which he taught and lived, or to impose the literalism and dogmatism which began in the early distortions of the reports of his earthly ministry. Which will we present, Jesus, or the wanderings of the tradition away from him? Do the occidental exploitations of Asia, Africa and wherever there are pagans for men of our alleged Christendom to oppress, intimidate us from committing the exploited to the guardianship of the humane Christ? The fear of perplexing an immature Christianity by discriminations in the Christian scriptures implies that assertion of the infallibility of the letter which is the source of interminable confusion. In some of the most successful foreign missions this burden is not bound upon men's shoulders; this peril to Christian growth is not hazarded. The hesitation seems strange to certain great Christian and some anti-Christian movements in the Orient.

It is primarily for the little ones that the real Christ must be learned, that they may be first in the world's estimate, as in his heart, and that they may have the real Jesus to believe in, the real Christ to lead them on. This investigation has need of them; for that which simplicity of heart desires is the Christ whom we may love

and follow. This impulse to love and follow him is essential to every process of learning him. It shows what we are to look for. By its recognition of him the discrimination is most clear between distorted presentations of him and the realities of his wisdom and tenderness and heroic devotion. Historic criticism seeks Jesus by the way of love.

That which must be judged unauthentic is not therefore without significance. Words and deeds imputed to a great soul by those in whom he lives may be invaluable interpretations of that great soul. The supreme instances are in the fourth gospel.

In the gospels criticism finds some reports which are without such significance, or which even pervert Jesus' teachings and misrepresent his ministry. The correction which must be made is not loss, but a concentration like that of heat and light in the sun. We may expect to see this concentration unfolding to the realm of his redemption, the social universe of his thought and life and love.

III

The relation of New Testament science to the Christian religion is accordant with the relation of science to any aspect of human life. The function of science is always limited and subordinate, and none the less necessary. It always furnishes materials for uses beyond itself. Even when there is no application of its discoveries it serves the joy and power of him who discovers and of those to whom he imparts; else such discoveries would have no motive nor value. Its services are all for the joy and worth of the human life which transcends any scientific definition, and which in its unity of experience we call the soul,—concerning which science has but a descriptive task. All its contributions serve developments beyond

its scope, beauty and blessedness above its range. Science, like the physical body, means more to the man to whom it is an instrument than to the man to whom it is an end. So above any contribution which New Testament science can make to the understanding of Jesus rises the life of Jesus and our life from him. Any attempt of New Testament science to give the meaning, the final reality of Jesus, is as shallow and impertinent as the recurrent attempts of scientists who do not know their work in its relations, to answer as within the range of science the problems of what we essentially are, and of the inmost nature of that to which we are fundamentally related. A great teacher refers us to intuition for the attainments of that for which no scientific material and process are sufficient. A greater teacher finds them in the personal social developments of that inner life to which he gave the deepest meaning.

Thus the function of science is indispensable. It furnishes the materials of life, and its classifications and methods make the materials usable. It relieves of what is useless. The higher uses demand, for their own sake, its utmost accuracy, its largest scope, that it may furnish all that life can use, from life's simplest developments up to the consummation of its highest aspirations. One who has mastered New Testament science, but not for that purpose, has less of Jesus and his gospel than any trustful and loving little child. Yet from New Testament science we obtain materials for higher experiences of our Lord and more serviceable life in him.

All science serves religion. For essential to religion is completeness of life. All that can be known is of this service, presenting the materials which contribute to life's completeness. Depreciation of the procedures and results of science is a diminution of religious values.

Our age characterized by scientific investigation must leave many interpretive tasks for its more favored suc-

cessors. It is accumulating data for the science of the future, which will be able to submit larger attainments, that larger vital significancies may be gained from them. In this incomplete stage is the science of the New Testament.

We do not expect extensive documentary discoveries in this field. But we are learning continually more of the age, people, conditions of life and thought in which Jesus, Christianity and their records came into being; more of individual, social and historic psychology; more of other religious movements whose comparison is important for the understanding of the supreme religious movement and its memorials; better methods of historic research and literary criticism in other fields, in applications to this field; and we are learning to estimate influences upon and from the leaders of men, including Jesus. In these lights that critically constructive study of Jesus and his career which centres upon the gospels is to a considerable extent a science of methods, combinations, of learning what to search for and how to search for it, of distinguishing the verifiable from the hopelessly elusive. In the present attainments of mankind, science, including this science, is young and is finding its way.

Yet in this and every field the vital, interpretive use of the contributions of science must be dominant, or its impulse would be destroyed. To live is man's concern, and by the meanings of things he lives. Every advance of scientific knowledge, in however early a stage, contributes at once to the significance of the life that appropriates it.

So though the science of the New Testament in its present stage is an incomplete knowledge of Jesus and of that which came into the world through him, mankind is not compelled to defer vital interpretations to a better time. We depreciate too much the results already established when we call them fragmentary. Science refutes

each current attempt to reduce Jesus to a myth, not only by answering its arguments, but also by showing that each mythical hypothesis involves inventions upon inventions, supplementary hypotheses that reduce it to the unscientific. In this refutation and in positive investigations, certain conceptions of Jesus and his spiritual creations have been so verified and clarified that our appreciation of him is far more vital than that which was formed from uncritically inconsistent pictures of him, and through these results of science faith and love find their way to his heart.

In New Testament scholarship there is a general consensus of established method. Departures from it lead nowhere. There are also certain conclusions in which scholars generally agree, and upon them they base their discussions of further problems. It will not be necessary for our practical purpose to consider views which scholarship has now outgrown, although often adopting valuable suggestions from them, nor views still under discussion that do not affect fundamentally interpretations of Jesus. Important differences of view will compel consideration. They, with every other topic which belongs to our purpose, can be treated in untechnical language, in a presentation which appeals to those who seek in Jesus answers to the problems of humanity.

Without science Christ in his social redemptions cannot be adequately known. Yet not by science can he be received into the soul's life and humanity's life, but by the faith and love, the aspiration and devotion, to which we are increasingly conducted by the investigation of his actual history. The interpretation for which science furnishes materials will be found to be the recognition of him as meaning of all meanings, revelation and inspiration of all human tasks and powers. To be this is to be the life of God in man's soul and man's world.

IV

At the outset of the critically constructive attempt to recover the historic Jesus, it is of advantage to exchange the too prevalent mood of foreboding for the invigorating atmosphere of hopefulness. Beset with anxieties must he be to whom the four gospels had been virtually inerrant records but who now finds himself compelled to acknowledge in them inaccuracies, misconceptions, and inventions all the more misleading when unintentional. He feels treasure after treasure of Jesus' reported acts and words slipping from his clutch. He fears that the dearest, the indispensable of these spiritual goods may be lost at any moment, and that finally his great possessions may shrink to nothing. He is like the heir of a large estate, in which, when it has been delivered to his own administration, investment after investment goes wrong, one financial disaster after another bewilders him. It involves interests in extensive enterprises, partnerships in large concerns, all intertwined in a great world of affairs which overwhelms his ineptitudes, until loss after loss and the prospect of indefinable loss cast the shadow of poverty upon his soul.

Enviable in comparison is one who began with small capital, even were it no more than busy hands, stout heart and steady brain, and who sees his toil winning increments of a competency from year to year, while he is undaunted by incidental disappointments. It is he that is rich and the other is poor, though with manifold more possessions. One life is gain with hope of ever greater gain. The other is loss with fear of accelerating loss.

So the happy man in the realm of spiritual possessions is one whose attitude to the records of Jesus' life is expressed not by the fear, "What must I give up?" but by the hope, "What can I verify?" As he faces steadfastly the inaccuracies of memory and the greater inaccuracies of its

transmissions, especially evident in unschooled witnesses and their untrained reporters, as he takes account of the rank growths of legend and myth among wonder-loving people in an unscientific time, and of the intrusions and prejudices by which current notions and later situations distorted the tradition of Jesus' words and deeds, then every winning of reality is an intimate possession, every clue to the authentic makes straight in the desert a highway for the Lord. But the fearful believer who refuses to inquire receives an unlimited doubt into the springs of his faith.

In every realm of spiritual life, of faith in God, of hope in the hereafter, of the significance of humanity among the immensities, he is poor who sits among large inheritances, dreading, as he is forced to dread, their diminution: he is rich who discerns against darkness and confusions the beginning of a light that guides. In the attainment of the knowledge of Jesus, as in all spiritual adventure, the discipline of mind and soul which is won by the toil is mind's growth and soul's growth in that supreme good, the life of Jesus. The attainment of ourselves in him grows from more to more.

May the statement be repeated that every attempt to deny the historic Jesus involves such a piling up of hypotheses upon one another to explain how that conviction came to be, such a multiplicity of inventive explanations, each demanding others without end, that they topple over outside the realm of historic science, and the constructive criticism of the New Testament proceeds unimpeded by them. There are certain historic events whose denial is scientifically impossible. Radical historic agnosticism was swept away a couple of centuries ago. The consensus of New Testament scholarship does not depreciate the representatives of the mythical hypothesis; it is necessary that every explanation of Jesus should be ex-

amined. And the attempts that failed brought to light valuable discriminations.

We have more than an ideal Christ. For some, to whom a conception seems more important than concrete reality, the Christ conception seems sufficient which would express the best in humanity. It appears of slight importance to them whether the accounts of Jesus in the gospels contain historic elements, since those accounts are regarded by them as representative and symbolic of human ideals.

The nobility and dignity of this attitude is evident in its appeal, and it contains truth that must never be lost in the severest historic investigations. But where are human ideals to be found except in concrete human lives, in which abstract and general conceptions of worth and loveliness have reality and power? Life is idealized by the communication of thought to thought, of purpose to receptiveness, of love to the capacity of love which it creates. Even the inspirational delight which nature imparts could not be without the mutual awakenings of the hearts that receive it; and the best that a man reaps from his own soul is from seed that other hands have sown. To be swayed by the lives that shame us and set us free, this is the idealization of life. Therefore we seek the ideal Christ as concrete human, no composite portrait, but personal vitality. It is indeed formed from the best that man has experienced, achieved, and aspired toward, but that best consummated in the supremely great soul, whom men may love as a person only can be loved. In that love we experience the concentration of redemptive power, the revelation of glories which without him enter not into the heart of man, the vindication of life idealized in its victory over the world, the invincible impartation to men of what they must be.

The urgent importance of knowing the aims of Jesus has been emphasized for every man who would efficiently serve

the needs of this time. Turning our search in this direction we move toward that which is most characteristic of Jesus, peculiarly accessible, and which, in union with accredited methods of critical construction, furnishes a pervasive test of authenticity. A man is best known in his aims. However difficult the work of penetrating to them through the confusions of reports and traditions concerning him, yet because in a great soul they shape his words and deeds, it is the growing apprehension of his aims which furnishes the test of the authenticity of the reports and traditions concerning him. All through this book the phrase, The aims of Jesus, is preferred to the phrase, The ends of Jesus. The word end connotes something beyond the process. The word aim connotes that which is in the process, a progressive realization.

To say that one who is a real man is known by his parentage, early life, formative influences and environment, is but half the truth, and that half misstated. These are the stuff from which he shapes himself, but the shaping power which is the real, vital self, is that which he sets before himself to do, is that activity which is his soul. It uses and transforms the genetic elements. It has its derivations from other lives, including those to whom he owes his inheritances, but the derivations are appropriations when they become self-creative powers of this his distinct personal social being. The life which is below the human and the lives of men not humanized may be interpreted genetically (if we leave out of account their inclusions in a larger purpose of which they are not aware); a true human life must be interpreted in its own purpose. The aims of a real man enable us to understand his formative influences as materials for his aims, which are the attainments of himself.

In the formation and working out of aims a man emerges into the freedom which is essential to personality. Though

in all else you may be determined by an iron necessity which is ultimately from beyond the human, working upon you constantly, and may be determined by that in your past life which the unhuman necessity determined, so that in all these you are but a part of the vast machine of things, yet you may, as adult, or youth, or little child, set before yourself a real aim, which as aim passes beyond that which has been derived and makes these derivations materials for the realization of itself.

Though multitudes may fail of even attempting this liberation, or may never be conscious of its possibility, it is none the less a reality for the man who dares it. Though men may be vastly deceived in themselves, supposing themselves free in actions and thoughts which are necessitated, and though many who are peculiarly egoistic, ambitious, domineering, owe these unsublimated impulses to the concentrations of the brute inheritance which is self-assertative and predacious, yet there is a test of the real aims, which passes beyond these and all that is determined upon you; but it is not an easy test.

The test is nothing less than life's great battle, in which victory is not determined for any man, and in which it is to be decided whether those things which you call your aims actually assert and maintain themselves as beyond any necessitated elements in your life. They are in the unphysical realm of integrity, holiness, love, with an obedience which is not constrained, a self-development which is continually self-creative. The victory which is wrought through the militant years is the subduing and sublimating of everything within you and which comes to you, to the realized aims. This is the victory which overcometh the world. Antagonistic is the vast bulk of that which is determined in the world of men, yet you do not fight alone. On your side are all souls that are fighting out their liberty. From their accomplishment of aims

you can appropriate that which works for the winning of your own freedom, strengthening, enlarging, fulfilling it. This is the social conflict for the true humanity, which your own progress serves. Therefore you need to know the great souls and to know them in their aims, which are they. You make their aims your own, thus becoming one with them and with the inclusive purpose of humanity vital in them. And these aims you serve in your own task with your own materials.

For illustration of the supreme significance of aims, and for their test of the authenticity of reports and traditions, take one of the finest of your friends,—or let me take one of the greatest of mine. What is the knowledge of him which I desire, and how do I get it? I happen to know a great many facts about him, some of which help to a knowledge of him, for they are manifestations of the man. They may be said to reveal his spirit, his character, but these terms are rather vague. They attain concrete, real meaning when I know what he is living for and working for. It is his aims that interpret his words and deeds. His aims are he.

Because the aims of this my friend are pursued with illumined and unremitting energy, and because they are concentrated into a unity of aim, they pervade and transform that from which his inmost self makes his whole self. His deeds and words, as I see and hear them and learn of them, continually make his aims clearer to me. And as I know his aims better, I know his actions and words better, knowing many of them before they are done or spoken. If I should observe in him things which seem to contradict his aims I would question the accuracy of my observations. If I were told of such things I would not believe them except by the constraint of indisputable proof. In an extreme case I would deny the possibility of indisputable proof. It would be reasonable to assume a mistake some-

where. Yet he, essentially entire as he is, would rebuke me if I declared that nothing in him is exempt from the sovereignty of that purposive freedom. In one in whom that is complete, as we shall find it complete in Christ, there is a complete test. His words and deeds, shaped by his aims, are authenticated by the test of their expressing and realizing his aims.

You who have never seen my friend have harder work to know him than I with my lifelong intimacy. Yet it will be evident that your knowledge of him is essentially of the same kind as mine and acquired by essentially the same method. I assume that you are obliged to depend for information upon his pupils, neighbours, those who live in the same place with him, those who have met him more or less casually, and those who report of him at second hand. I exclude knowledge of him derived from his writings; for Jesus, with reference to whom this parallel is drawn, left nothing in writing beyond words traced on the ground with his finger, which were soon obliterated by careless feet.

Of my friend the legends have already accumulated which grow around any man who is great and loved. People tell you all manner of contradictory things about him. They report sayings of bewildering inconsistency. If he had lived nineteen centuries ago the legendary element in the reports concerning him would have grown rankly into the supernatural and superhuman.

The evident exaggerations, wonder-tales concerning him, or another, are not without significance. They put you on your guard against the intrusion of any account of him which cannot be verified. On the other hand their occurrence indicates the remarkableness of the man around whom the apocryphal stories have gathered, and their quality has connections with his quality. To that extent the legendary has value. And though there are stories which wander over the world, attaching themselves, like

stray dogs, to various individuals, yet like vagabond dogs they attach themselves to those who have the qualities that attract them. If it should be objected: your scepticism presupposes that this man, or another, is as other men, that the reports of him are to be tested by canons that apply to ordinary men, while he is the extraordinary man, you might properly answer: I cannot thus base historic knowledge of him. Even if such things be at the pinnacle they cannot enter into the foundation.

From the conglomerations of the testimonies concerning him you who are limited to them try to construct historic knowledge of my friend. For from them, in their confusions, you perceive that his words and actions express aims which you need for the purposefulness of your own soul. In the light of this initial discernment you essay your discriminations. There are certain critical processes, to be spoken of later, which you will undertake. Anticipating that these have been attempted, they have led you to the test of essential authenticity: does this and that report make his aims a clearer unity? Then by the increased clarity of your knowledge of his aims you test the reports further, eliminating those which contradict your knowledge of his aims, disregarding that which is irrelevant to them. So back and forth you weave your picture, and the portrait becomes a likeness. You bring these complements of one another into a closer, larger unity of historic knowledge. Though you should never recover the original form of a single saying of his, though you may never determine the detailed shape of any of his deeds, none the less you have the right to declare: such were his essential thoughts, such his characteristically purposive actions; for these express his aims.

If you discover one aim of his you have entered his interior life. If you discern in the report of any act or word, and it may be an imperfect report, the outshining of an aim,

you stand at the threshold of his soul, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. For whatever incongruities may beset him, his aims, which are his essential being, are a cosmos, his simplicity of soul. Wherever we touch this vital thread it leads on into all that he is essentially, arduous as must be our strivings along that way. The more the unification has been realized, for that is his life's hard task, and the more all the materials of his life are subdued, transformed to that which is his life indeed, the more assured and vital is your knowledge of him; while at the same time the more difficult and aspirational is the task necessitated upon us who would unite ourselves with a great personality. So in relation to the supremely integrated personality, Jesus of Nazareth.

This attempt involves the utmost investigation and classification of the testimonies. Some are more direct than others. Some witnesses are evidently of a more reliable kind than others. You study the peculiarities of different witnesses; as in a document you feel beneath the written word the man or woman whose witness or report of witness is given there. It is also important for you to know the heredity and environment both of the witnesses and of him to whom they testify. Further suggestions along this line can be obtained from text-books on evidence and from treatises on historic method. Whether we have oral testimony or documents that report it, whether the man we seek to know be in this land or another, in this age or another, in this phase of civilization or another, the methods of a real knowledge of him are essentially the same. The discovery of aims is always all-important. Though we have the most reliable testimony which does not disclose the aims which make the man, we have gained nothing that is worth seeking. Though the best testimonies we can obtain are confused and in many of their elements contradictory, yet if by their aid we attain the

aims, which are the man, we have gained the essential of that which we seek, we have achieved that which is worth the pains. That is, we have gained such supreme things if we take these aims and therefore that personality into our souls.

In the studies of the testimonies to Jesus' life, the meticulous toil of the textual critic has great value. It is also important that experts analyze the reports into the documents where they severally belong, investigate the origins and fortunes of these documents, and compare, by every laboriously acquired skill in the sifting of such evidence, the divergencies of different reports, account for the divergencies, and trace the results as far as possible toward the original occurrence. And the environment is to be studied genetically, from the homes and farms of Galilee through to the religious and social currents of land and empire, of race and civilization. Comparison of other religious movements and their leaders gives light. May it be repeated that this work is of such a nature that its essentials can be presented untechnically to those who are not technically trained in this field. It is of such a nature that the general intelligence of men is competent to judge the findings of technical proficiency.

When we first essayed really to read the New Testament, whether with or without the scholar's apparatus, then through the traditions, so overlaid and confused, something of the aims of Jesus appeared, the objects which he set his life to accomplish. His aims determined what he said and did and was. By the light of a discovered aim of Jesus we read afresh the accounts which conceal and reveal those aims, discriminating concealments from revelations, accepting as essentially his that which a discovered aim shines through. In the reports thus discriminated the aims appear still clearer, and again in this increased clarification we further examine the testimonies. So the comparing

and uniting process ever advances, if (and this is essential) we learn the aims of Jesus by making them our own. The procedure employs all that the severest scholarship can hammer out. It accepts light from every source that makes the materials of the task more numerous and distinct. The result will be greater than we can foresee, for our task continually unfolds. Yet it seems a sanguine expectation that we can ever regain in any considerable volume sayings of Jesus just as he said them, actions of his just as he performed them. Yet the sifted accounts of words and deeds that manifest his aims are essentially from him and of him. They are his creation. What further authenticity do we need? They are usable for every life, for the world's life constrained by him to its consummations. And whatever is contradictory or irrelevant to that is none of his, wherever it may be written. The difficulties of the task bring Jesus closer, clearer to us than he would be otherwise, for they awaken powers for the understanding of him. Since his aims determined him, and because we can take his aims into mind and heart and soul, from the real Jesus the concealments fall, the vapours are scattered. We stand in the God-illumined presence of the man of Nazareth. We receive the power that floods from him to save the world.

In this historic achievement we win more than historic probability, even at its utmost. When we receive the aims of a great soul into ourselves they are in our soul and life present realities, interior forces, yet in no severance from the life and career of him from whom we receive them. And whatever in that life, however remote in place and time, is disclosure and incarnation of its aims, belongs essentially in that which is now and is inwardly our own.

"But near, warm, tender, even yet
A present help is he;
And faith has still its Olivet,
And love its Galilee."

CHAPTER III

THE COURSE OF THE TRADITION

I

The technical method of scholarship in its effort to learn the ministry of Jesus includes the documentary analysis of the synoptic gospels, by methods indicated toward the close of the previous chapter. New Testament scholarship regards the fourth gospel as a spiritual interpretation of inestimable value, but less closely connected with the early tradition of Jesus' ministry than are the other three. An estimate of its historic importance and of its relations with the early tradition, a subject which eminent scholars are investigating with peculiar care, can be best given later. The achievements of the technical processes make possible another method of presentation more attractive to those not technically trained in this department. Practical for them is a sketch of the formation of the tradition from its beginning, with the author's use of the results of the technical method. Such a practice is common in descriptions of historic developments. The investigator works back that the reader may go forward. When in this narrative we come to the composition, or rather the compilation, of the written gospels, which is to be briefly described in our fifth chapter, our progress will have been along a living way which gives a vital intelligibility to their varied contents.

Appreciation of the study of documents, such as those from which the synoptic gospels were composed, implies sympathy with their vital sources. A document, unless it is a merely formal register, is expressive of the mind and

heart and purpose of those from whose life it flowed. As we read the evangelists we hear through them and from beyond them reverent voices, we look into adoring eyes of those who loved to speak of Jesus. Understanding of those who were the originals of the sources of our gospels, of what they were and how they felt and lived, is necessary for a sound judgment of the documentary testimonies. It is especially important to be acquainted with those with whom the tradition began, the Christian community in Jerusalem—which it is convenient to call the church in Jerusalem.

It is fundamentally necessary to emphasize that these disciples of Jesus were none the less Jews in their religious consciousness. No conception of their Master as the founder of a new religion ever entered their thoughts. His and theirs were "The adoption and the glory and the covenants and the giving of the law and the ritual service and the promises." They were faithful to the observances of Judaism. This involves the complete, consummate Judaism of Jesus. And this emphasis, as later chapters will disclose, is essential to the understanding of him, his work, his gospel and his disciples.

It is possible to know what manner of men they were, how they lived and worked together, what were their absorbing interests, what were the principal characteristics of their most influential leaders. Those letters of Paul which the consensus of scholarship pronounces genuine have revealed those early disciples to us more clearly since scholarship has learned not to underestimate their influence upon him. The increased appreciation of the book of Acts includes the judgment that notwithstanding omissions, misconceptions, legendary accretions, predilections of the author and of his sources, we can gain through it acquaintance with those who "cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." The penetrative study

of the Jewish life and thought which were shared by these faithful Jews; the influence upon them of that heart of the Jewish race, Jerusalem, with its temple; events in Jerusalem and centering there which acted upon the church and to which the church reacted, many of which are known to us from secular sources,—these and other materials introduce us to those early disciples of Jesus. So prominent in early Christianity was the church in Jerusalem that its influence and therefore its character can be traced on many pages not only of the New Testament but of other ancient Christian literature, and also in events and movements, and these data throw light upon its first stages. We also learn what these men were from the tradition of Jesus which they began and which included their own thoughts and feelings concerning it and him. Our knowledge of them involves a knowledge of the course of the tradition as shaped by them.

II

Resident leaders of the church for a number of years and moulders of the best elements of the tradition were the intimate companions of Jesus' ministry, whom it is convenient to call the twelve apostles, but without assuming that Jesus instituted a distinct order with a rigidly limited membership. With them, as with the early Christians generally, the tradition of Jesus' ministry was a subordinate interest. They looked not so much back to their companionship with him as forward in expectation of his glorious appearing. And the recollections which they cherished most were their visions of the Christ risen from the death on the cross. Their gospel was that he who had been crucified is the Christ, risen and to come again. Their argument was less his life than proof-texts from the Old Testament. The life of Christians and the Christian

community must indeed be governed by his teachings; but these were derived not only from his mortal lips, but also from revelations and spiritual inspirations believed to be from the Christ exalted. How these interests affected the tradition from its earliest formations will be considered later. What is noted here is the subordinate importance to the early disciples of much that is so vital to us. That which they held as of peculiar value in their recollections of Jesus consisted of acts that seemed to illumine his Messiahship and words that served the church's needs, and such acts and words were the most cherished by other believers.

Yet they, like all normal people, loved to talk with one another and with entranced listeners about memories which were dear for their own sake, words and acts of their Master which create insights into his personality: how he took up in his arms the little children that were brought to his healing touch, his look of love upon the man of rare spiritual promise, his courtesies, solicitudes, indignations, his sorrows and his joys. Such wonderful contacts of souls with him were wrought into their testimony that Jesus is the Christ.

The apostolic tradition was a group tradition. Memories were compared. Of these group-memories were the reminiscences of Peter, to whom the evangelists owe much of their best. Since the apostolic tradition is the foundation of knowledge of Jesus, to be distinguished from the intrusions of inferior sources, it is important to inquire what manner of men they were, and in what ways their Master impressed upon them his words, his deeds, himself.

Their companionship with him lasted about a year, according to the indications of the synoptic gospels, two years according to the fourth gospel, when apparent displacements in that gospel are rearranged. In either case

it was short enough for memory to grasp it as a whole, and long enough for definite impression. The apostolic tradition shows his relations with John the Baptist; then his work in Galilee, where he met an enthusiastic popular reception which was opposed by religious authorities and regarded with disfavor by the secular power. Then he retired with his followers into neighbouring regions; and they accompanied him when he consummated his work by the appeal to the centre of his people and race, at the annual great gathering in Jerusalem. If, as the fourth gospel states, there were other appearances of Jesus at the holy city during his ministry, it was in the companionship of permanent followers.

Many of Jesus' sayings were connected with events, and words and events with crises, which produced vivid impressions of words and deeds. Nearly half the synoptic gospels is occupied with acts and teachings which are attributed to the short period from his expression of determination to carry his message to Jerusalem for that last festival, down to the end of his career; though the witness of the apostles is broken by their flight on that last night. Though the displacements of memory are notorious, and unhistoric traditions from inferior sources were attracted there, this period is distinguished above others in his ministry by the tremendous import of events ineffaceable.

The great leader selects the best assistants available for the great task. This is indicated in the case of Jesus by the reports of his testing of a scribe for intimate companionship, and of a man conspicuous for social position and intelligence as well as character. The universal sympathy and the understanding of men which were requisite may be strongest in the exceptional mind and broad culture, as is proved by finer intellects of all ages who have learned from him the depths of this wisdom. But the

intellectually and culturally superior of his day failed to leave all and follow him. The indispensable sympathy and understanding he found in the common ranks. We shall have abundant reason to hold that he made no mistake in his selections. The story of Judas' betrayal of him bears the stamp of legend, as I trust will be made evident later, and Jesus' wisdom in selecting his associates is not brought into question by a choice of one capable of the extreme villainy. It belongs to the intellectual supremacy of him who gave the highest truth to the multitude, though always congenially impartive to those who were not of the multitude, that he was content to work with the instruments that were available, magnanimously recognizing their worth and patient with their limitations. These men were unspoiled by the conceit of knowledge or by a wealth ignorant of its functions. They were the natural channels to the common humanity which was his passion.

Moral and spiritual imperfections of these companions of Jesus are not spared by the gospels. Apostolic authority and dignity had become so impressive in the time when these gospels were written that we must assign the insistence of defects to the apostolic tradition itself. They were slow of heart to understand the Master's teachings. Selfish ambition had to be shamed out of them. "They forsook him and fled." Their most conspicuous representative denied him. The apostolic company were indeed confused and uncertain in what was to them and would have been to any men a new world of thought and action. Their deficiencies stand in the all-searching light of Jesus' mind and character. But they were capable of greatness and Jesus made them great. We shall find reason to recognize in one of them a spiritual genius of very high order. Peter's attainments were shared by the rest, as is evident even in the limitations of the records

of early Christian history. Though the apostles were overshadowed, whether for results better or worse, by the achievements of Paul, depreciation of them has no foundation.

"Unlearned and ignorant men," in the sense of lacking rabbinic learning, they were not illiterate. The Jewish home and the Jewish school, though the latter had not been developed in their day to the scope which it attained later, had given them the rudiments of a secular education, incidental to their religious education. Like all devout Jews they were constant at the instructive services of the synagogue, whose influence filled the normal Jewish home. From the class available, the intelligent plain people, Jesus chose the ablest and best.

The companions of Jesus were intent upon their task of learning what their Master had to teach them. The familiar comparison of their minds to sheets of paper so blank that there was nothing to confuse his writing is of course psychologically and historically absurd. Such minds are incapable of retaining the print of anything. And these men were Jews, instructed in the synagogue, disciples of the law, the prophets and the psalms and of scribal explanations of them, and were affected more than most of their fellow-countrymen by the religious and political interests which occupied the Jewish mind of their day. This intensity of interest was a necessary motive for their discipleship. A considerable part of the instruction which Jesus gave them was to correct and replace. Complete success in guarding the remembrance of his own teachings from the intrusions of his pupils' previous notions would have been, as every teacher knows, as great a portent as a walk upon the waves. And all through his companionship with that inner circle, popular demands, as the chronic political disaffection, were continually encroaching. Yet all the greater for the strength of

these interests and inheritances were their absorption in their teacher, their receptiveness and retentiveness.

The retentiveness of the oriental memory in these disciples must be recognized, but not exaggerated. Its feats are generally the result of a special discipline. Yet much of their previous instruction had been of a kind to strengthen memory. As men of simple lives and restricted interests they had an advantage over the man of broader culture. From many confusing sophistications the simpler memory is free, though preconceptions are often more tenacious. These men knew that the pupils of the teachers of the law were accomplished in engraving a master's words upon their minds, and to the greater Master was due the same studious fidelity. But the relation of Jesus to his disciples had a difference. He was their leader in a great enterprise, and his teaching of them was for the aims along which he led them. For this discipleship the mnemonic type of mind was not prerequisite. He was less concerned for the remembrance of his words than for the understanding of his purpose.

Among the facts that are evident from the recognition of an historic Jesus, which involves a tradition of him as the basis of the synoptic gospels, is his supreme art as teacher. His skill in bringing high thoughts to the common apprehension by uniting them with the common, the universal interests and experiences of human life, involved a form of presentation best adapted to remembrance, the parable. Memory is not a perfect instrument even for the preservation of his parables. We cannot attribute the parables of the gospels to him without discriminations. Some of them are evidently expressions of thoughts of the early church that we shall find not to be his thoughts. And there are intrusions, like the repellent slaughter of the king's enemies in the third gospel's version of the parable of money in trust. That which is

none of his separates itself from his truth, naturalness and beauty. The reports of his parables preserved not only fundamental ideas, but also colourings and shadings which cannot be attributed to any artistry attainable by the evangelists or their sources. Yet the loss of many beauties and glories of construction and expression seems indicated by the exquisiteness and completeness of some of the parables, notably those peculiar to the third gospel. For their preservation we seem to be indebted to some hearer or hearers endowed, as plain folk frequently are, with spiritually artistic appreciation and memory retentive of beautiful things.

Impressive concreteness of expression was characteristic of his sayings generally. A vivid picture expressed a universal principle. Failure to distinguish between the two is one of the worst faults of exegesis, ancient and modern, and has, as applied to certain passages, perverted the sanity of his teaching. From such misconceptions the circle of his intimate companions was not exempt. It is told that when he spoke of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod the diciples said one to another, "It is because we have taken no bread." This case of misapprehension, whether authentic or not, should guard us against other misunderstandings. The tradition has kept Jesus' awareness of the defect of his method, which was yet the best possible for communicating and preserving his thought. Reference has been made to his custom of connecting great instructions with acts, events and crises. There is more of this than is apparent in our gospels. They and their sources often put things together artificially, unhistorically, because of their real or fancied resemblances.

Only a small part of Jesus' words and deeds was kept in the original tradition. A very small part of them has come to us. Alas for the inexhaustible wealth that has

been lost!—sermons in the synagogues and to the multitudes under the open sky, familiar conversations, friend with friends, illuminative directions to those who sought him or in meetings that seemed by chance, acts as exquisite as his taking little children up in his arms. The apostles repeated those acts and sayings especially which seemed to them important in evangelization and for the edification of their converts. When their reports were written, for the same purpose, in the sources of our gospels, there was a further selection and limitation. Yet this selection was of words and deeds which Jesus had made most impressive by content, form, and circumstance. What has reached us was told in the light of other acts and sayings. And words and deeds that had sunk beneath the apostles' conscious memory formed their minds for their better understanding of him. Yet alas for the wealth that we have lost!

The intimacy of Jesus with his chosen companions was, as the tradition could not fail to present it, without familiarity, in the lower meaning of that word. The ancient conception of revered teacher to revering pupils did not permit it; still less was it permissible between that which he was and what they were. The relation was without aloofness or pretentious condescension. It was most loving, tender, tactful, a continual safeguarding against error, an unwearying guidance into all good. It was the natural, inevitable, unsentimental attitude which he, in the consciousness of his supreme mission, created with the closest objects of his devotion who must be led into the partnership of his aims. When they attempted an intrusion into his reserve, whether incited by their own ambition or by solicitude for him, they encountered the impassible. Yet in every case which is reported he stopped their intrusiveness that he might lead them into revelations of truth and life.

Memory is more treacherous in its additions than in its omissions. A remembrance is a mental reconstruction, which we try to make complete, consistent and rational, by supplying details which were lacking in the experience recalled, or which have fallen out or become uncertain. It varies in different types of minds, with the degree and character of education and self-discipline, of appreciation of reality, of scientific or unscientific habit of mind. How wildly unregulated among the ignorant and untrained, and in times like that in which Jesus' disciples told of him! The reconstructive process is evident even in recollections in which we have only a slight personal interest. Where our personal interests are deeply concerned then appreciations and prejudices, faiths and unbeliefs, hopes or despairs, loves, dislikes or hates, purposes for good or evil, pour in their confusing contributions. Their design is not a mental transcript of actual occurrence but the gratification of our impulses, the enlargements of life, according to men's various conceptions of what the fulness of life consists in. Often these additions, emotional, purposive, give the significance of that which we recall, are selective of its values, creative of that whose reality is deepest. When the remembrance is of a glorious life, of a transcendent soul, which has wrought in us the ideals and powers which are of the real fulness of life, then memory's collecting and constructing tasks tend to become one.

It is in the light of this fact that we may answer the natural question: why did not Jesus do something more to safeguard the remembrance of his career and message? Why did he not make his disciples repeat his words over? Would it not have been more thorough to dictate his teachings for his disciples to write down? And he might have added a record of events. Or to make sure, why did he not write them himself, as other prophets have written, and hand them over? Every such question resolves itself

into this: why was not his method mechanical instead of vital, something less than the impartation of himself? Jesus, choosing with matchless skill the method favorable to the retention of his thoughts, would not extend that method beyond the scope of its vitality. With a magnificent recklessness he flung himself into the incalculable currents of the world's life. The all-important he has safeguarded: in the holy succession of his discipleship, through every incompleteness and misconception, he himself passes on from soul to soul.

The skill of Jesus in the selection of the companions who formed the apostolic element of the tradition of him, and the wisdom of his ways with them, are vindicated by the result. The greatest things in the world's greatest literature are from these men. The task of critical construction analyzes out of the tangles of the ancient tradition this golden strand. By this were influenced and are tested the other elements in the gospels. Though we do not possess this apostolic testimony at first hand, therefore not in its original power, and though we have to make allowance for its own defects and accretions, and though in the evangelists' reproduction of it there are intrusions of far inferior value, yet wherever we meet it we are brought to the feet of Jesus, we feel his healing touch, hear his voice of the Father's heart, look into the eyes where shines the light eternal.

III

For twelve years the church at Jerusalem was led, and its tradition formed, by Peter and the rest of the apostolic company. In Paul's last visit to Jerusalem it is evident that this situation was of the past. The narrative, full, clear and consistent, mentions none of the original apostolic company as present in the city, though it was passover time. The leadership of the church is held by one

who had not been a companion of Jesus' ministry, by "James, the Lord's brother." Associated with him are "the elders of the church," chosen for their "spiritual gifts," which included administrative ability.

The apostles had been drawn more and more into the evangelization and care of an expanding mission field. The religious unity of the Jewish race throughout the world implied the necessity of including all Jews everywhere in the accomplishment of the hope of Israel through Jesus, their Christ. Passages in the tenth chapter of Matthew and its parallels in the other synoptic gospels contain reminiscences of an evangelization of the Holy Land not long after Jesus' death. The mission that followed the martyrdom of Stephen exceeded these limits and included Gentiles. Then the way was open and the impulse aroused for further conquests, which required apostolic participation and leadership, with apostolic care of the results. Soon an external force speeded the inevitable tendency.

When the succession of Roman governors whose authority included Jerusalem was interrupted for three years by the rule of a Herod as king subject to Rome, his pretence of zeal for Judaism, along with other political motives, made him the agent of a persecution directed against the leaders of the church. He reigned from the year forty-one, twelve years after the most probable date of Jesus' death, to the year forty-four. The limitation of the account in the book of Acts to the martyrdom of the apostle James and the legend of Peter's deliverance by an angel implies the escape of most of the apostles. The persecution was restricted to Herod's jurisdiction, the Holy Land. In this emergency the leadership of the Jerusalem church was naturally transferred, as is indicated by a direction ascribed to Peter, to a brother of Jesus, who was also a participant of the earliest visions of the risen Lord,

and eminent in piety and ability, but not a companion of Jesus' ministry. The enforced continuous absence of the apostolic company for a term of years laid upon this brother of Jesus the responsibility of a leadership concealed from enemies during Herod's rule, more open after Herod's death and the resumption of administration by Roman officials. They had troubles enough without involving themselves in the persecution of a peaceable Jewish community of which they knew little and for whose religious views they cared not at all.

The lessening of apostolic intimacy with the mother church was by no means a severance. Even under Herod there were ways and means of communication. After the three years those who had been permanent companions of Jesus were drawn back repeatedly to Jerusalem, even from urgent missionary work, by ancestral custom and the exigencies of the centre of Christianity. This heart of the faith must be kept with all diligence, for out of it were the issues of the world's religious life. It was necessary to keep open and functioning the veins and arteries which connected it with the body of believers in Christ. This which was a special care of Paul was felt no less by the original apostles, though not for the same reasons altogether. In Jerusalem questions were to be passed upon which concerned the emergent Christian world, and apostolic presence was necessary for these discussions. Yet the demand for wider apostolic service became ever more urgent with the spread of the Christian faith. Dependence upon the twelve became less in Jerusalem under the leadership of James and his associates. The enforced absorption in the work outside during Herod's rule had committed them to the extended tasks. Both there and in Jerusalem the regulative unity of the apostolic testimony was impaired, and far less valuable elements had access to the tradition.

IV

Before we review the more general influences which affected the conceptions of Jesus' ministry, and therefore the accounts of it, it will be useful to indicate some of those especially important which are distinguishable from the apostolic tradition. The limits of that tradition will be examined in the chapter, Sources and Gospels. What is to be established there is anticipated here. Important for the conditions of Jesus' ministry is an examination of the evangelists' reports of a trial before the Sanhedrin and of their accounts of the crucifixion. These are evidently unconnected with the apostolic testimony.

The growth of the marvellous, though the love of it was present from the beginning, with a power of expansion, had been regulated by the recollections of those most influential, who had known Jesus best. Through every weakening of the barrier it seeped in. In the gospels it is manifest in the number and sensational details of works of healing and in the ascription to Jesus of miraculous powers over nature.

Another evident exaggeration should be eliminated from our conception of Jesus. The invectives attributed to him and preserved in our gospels, and modelled on Old Testament imprecations of cumulative woes, against the "scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, fools and blind, like whited sepulchres, snakes, breed of vipers," are indeed reminiscences, but grossly perverted, of the fundamental, inevitable, irreconcilable conflict of the religious consciousness of Jesus and certain elements of the dominant religious leadership of his day. That which he fought was—to anticipate again what will be developed later—inconsistent with the nobler elements of contemporaneous Jewish life and thought, of which he was the supreme representative. Not the temper of Jesus is disclosed in these

invectives but the developed tension between his followers and their antagonists.

The outrages of most of the Roman governors of the quarter century before the Jewish revolt goaded religious nationalism into a fanaticism which included increasing hate against "the sect of the Nazarenes." Not all the bitterness was confined to the persecutors. How far the spirit of revenge could possess those who claimed to be Christ's disciples is shown by abhorrent passages in the Christian as well as in the Jewish portions of the book of Revelation. It is not strange that reflections of that spirit cast its glare upon reports concerning Jesus, and that his endorsement was desired for that which was none of his. With eminent Jewish scholars we set against the ascription of such utterances to him the testimonies to his poise and dignity, compassion and forgiveness. Corroborative is the proven falsity of some specific charges attributed to him.

These invectives are extreme developments of the fundamental fault of the evangelists, their lack of appreciation of those spiritual elements of the Judaism of Jesus' day with which he was allied and by which he was inspired. The just estimate of them will be found important for our understanding of his aims. They are referred to at this point for their bearing upon the tradition in its inferior phases. In the best of the Jewish literature of that period, in excellent sayings of rabbis, in the prayers of the people, and in the lives of devoted men of various classes, there was a spirituality, a filial relation to God, an evaluation of the law as the Father's will, obedience to which is freedom and joy, all congenial to Jesus' own religious consciousness and which he separated from alien intrusions. These great things have continued through Jewish history, and are mighty in our own day. In them Jews and Christians "meet at their summits." Personal rela-

tions of Jesus were with congenial souls of this truly representative Judaism.

Important for the understanding of Jesus' career is the question of Jewish responsibility for his crucifixion. That assumption of Jewish guilt which has played its infernal part through centuries of prejudice and hate, oppression and persecution, outrage and massacre, has it an historic basis, or did it originate in an early Christian antagonism to hostile Jews? The desire, so evident in the book of Acts, to represent the Roman power as not unfriendly to Christianity, was an additional motive for transferring from its representative, Pilate, the responsibility for their Lord's death. In the evangelists' report, unsupported by apostolic testimony, of a trial by the Sanhedrin, it is difficult to accord with a session of such a court the hour of meeting, and the confused indications of place and procedure, even though its rules are not clearly known;—the regulations contained in the Mishna are not altogether applicable to that Sanhedrin. The assigned date of its meeting with reference to the passover (the synoptical statement has not been successfully explained away) presents great difficulties of contradition to Jewish law. The point is, the weakening of the synoptic testimony by its assertion of an impossible date.

The lack of dependableness in accounts of events connected with this alleged trial is illustrated in the tale of "Judas who betrayed him." What need of Judas to guide to Gethsemane, when Jesus' enemies could have him shadowed by their own agents every hour of the day and night? A conspicuous person, centre of a familiar group, is not easily lost track of. Some, appraising the difficulty, have surmised that Judas' betrayal was the disclosure of "the Messianic secret." There is no evidence that can make this more than a surmise. If the anointing at Bethany can by any possibility have had a royal and

Messianic significance, did they need to pay Judas for news scattered abroad on all the winds? Less worthy of mention is the finely spun romance of a benevolent intention in Judas' blundering brain. Anything could arouse suspicion of unfaithfulness at such a time, of any man concerned whose actions at the time were unexplained;—and did not the scriptures foretell that the Christ was to be assailed by his own familiar friend in whom he trusted? Suspicion once aroused is fertile in fancies that grow indefinitely. As probable an origin as any would be a disappearance of Judas before or during or just after the Last Supper, with no subsequent return to the company of disciples; whether because he took fright before the rest, or because his private affairs occupied him, or because,—see in such guesses how legends grow! Let him who is determined to believe read history in the tale: of his being "guide to them that took Jesus," when they had no need of him for guide; of Jesus' exposure of him at the Last Supper when none lifted a hand to stop the traitor and save the Master's life; of the bargain with the chief priests, of which there could be no available testimony, at a price stipulated in an ancient book; of his investment of the proceeds, after he had remorsefully returned them, in the same piece of real estate which was bought by those who had bribed him; of the superfluous kiss of shameless treachery; of how he hanged himself and also accidentally disembowelled himself; of Jesus' blind confidence in a man capable of the vilest crime, and of Jesus' knowledge long before that he was keeping a devil in the innermost circle of his friends. The whole story is of one quality throughout. Beneath the legendary husks we find no historic kernel. Still Judas remains to all ages a solemn warning,—not to condemn any man before examining the evidence.

It is also difficult to make a consistent story of the al-

leged participation of the Sanhedrin and the Pharisaic leaders of the people. Jesus' reported attitude and words at the trial are not consistent with what a further study of his aims will, I trust, disclose. Accusations ascribed to the false witnesses seem suggested by his cleansing of the temple, and for that very reason do not involve a testimony given at a trial before the Sanhedrin. Outrageous behaviour of the council, both at the trial and before the cross, is hard to believe of men who were at least conscious of official dignity. Quite un-Roman is Pilate's shifty palaver. All is without apostolic testimony. It is also just that we should demand strong testimony to authenticate an insistent demand of the people that Jesus be crucified. It would have been easy to exaggerate into a popular expression the not improbable loud voices of hangers-on of the high-priestly ring. The whole account lacks sufficient evidence to condemn the Jewish people and their representative religious leaders.

There is evident the lack of necessity for an action of the Sanhedrin in order to secure the execution. The combination of Roman and priestly interest in Jesus' death was enough. The alleged motive of effect to be produced upon the people by official condemnation of Jesus for blasphemy (though a claim of Messiahship was not blasphemy) must be offset by the evident advantage, for retaining popular esteem, of non-participation in the execution.

There is a stronger case against the high priests, by whom is meant the small circle, the ring, of the most conspicuous members of the priesthood. Circumstances of Peter's denial of Christ tell heavily against them, and corroborate other suspicious indications of their complicity with the Roman governor in the execution of Jesus. Peter's denial is beyond question. Nothing can account for the currency in Christian circles of such a charge against the honoured leader except the fact itself, estab-

lished by Peter's own contrite confession. The guilt of these men could be easily imputed to others (participation of Sadducees outside the high-priestly circle is without evidence) and this natural impulse includes charges against the real religious leaders and representatives of Judaism. Least of all men of the Jewish race did the Sadducean priests express Jewish faith, sentiment, principles and national hope. For the last eighteen centuries Judaism has eliminated the trace of any influence from the Sadducees. Judaism is not responsible for what a few of them perpetrated.

It is not difficult to determine the situation of which the crucifixion was the inevitable issue. There was the Roman government, watchful, especially at passover time, against any possible beginning, source, or suggestion of popular disturbance, ruthless in suppressions and represented in Pilate by a cruel incompetent.

There were the people generally unreconciled to Roman rule. Widespread, notwithstanding the pacific policy of their Pharisaic religious leaders, was the expectation of a Christ to be sent to deliver them. There were elements ready for insurrection, and other elements liable to be swept into it. A great multitude from Galilee was present at the feast, their minds largely occupied with Jesus, some of them doing and saying all sorts of foolish, reckless things that made him an object of suspicion to the Roman government. The story of the popular outburst at Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem is indeed an exaggeration at least. If it had been as represented the Roman power would have taken quick action against the acclaim of the kingdom and its Davidic king. Any part or suggestion by Jesus in such a scene is contrary to his conceptions, his methods, his attitude from first to last. Yet the story represents, along with the appeal of Bartimæus, a popular feeling which the Roman, cognizant of the popular reac-

tion to the Galilean ministry, would have been blind indeed not to see.

There was Jesus exposed to the popular sentiment and the government. His work was that of teacher and prophet in Jerusalem at the feast, as always; yet the prophetic work included the cleansing of the temple, the attempt to restore it from the greed and domination of the high-priestly ring to its divine intent, the "house of prayer for all nations." His act and purpose brought upon him the implacable hatred of those whose power and gain were involved. Nor could Jesus deny categorically that he was the Christ, though his Messiahship transcended and excluded every political effort. The peril from the high-priestly hostility and the alert Roman jealousy was unavoidable and fatal. The high-priestly ring, ruthless as Rome, highest political power under Rome, instruments of Rome in their Romanizing policy, the Roman government desired to please, with them it connived.

With such a situation and such actors in the tragedy, there could be but one issue. Other elements are superfluous; and their participation can be accepted only on evidence more direct and consistent than is offered to historic judgment.

These instances have been selected not only because of the importance of the questions involved, but also because they make especially clear the need of discriminations in the tradition. They make evident the importance of the apostolic testimony. Yet through all the tradition of Jesus we encounter obscurations of him. In the next chapter we seek the reality of Jesus and his aims through the mists.

CHAPTER IV

THROUGH THE MISTS

Marvel and ecstasy pervade the early history of great popular religious movements and obscure the character and career of their founders. Between Jesus and us is a tradition profoundly affected by faith in miracles, by visions of him as risen from the dead, by revelations and inspirations supposed to be received from the exalted Christ, and by the intense hope of his speedy return in glory. In this category belong tremendous impressions from his crucifixion.

I

To a student of religious history the question whether Jesus possessed supernatural and superhuman powers is not suggested by the evangelists. The wonder-tales are accounted for by the love of the marvellous attaching itself to a great personality. Even the apostolic tradition was open to it. Whatever in the Master's deeds could be so interpreted was to his companions power and sign, and such an interpretation grew in their memories of him. It spread more rankly outside this circle. The modern disciple of Jesus can pursue his study of the Master and can serve and follow him in the scientific spirit which was unknown and inconceivable to early Christianity. To us an attestation by miracle would be an obstacle to the faith and task which belong to rational minds in an ordered universe. To our conviction the spiritual approves itself by its own truth and needs no sign.

The scientific habit does not involve the rejection of all

Jesus' works of healing. The power of mind to affect bodily health is undisputed. Its limits have not yet been defined. That there are limits beyond which it is not radically remedial is evident to our science. Original Christianity had no conception of them. There are no boundaries to the world of miracle. The most wonder-loving exaggerations are inevitable there. It was not incredible that he should raise the dead.

Criticism's ability to distinguish here between fact, exaggeration and fiction, is insufficient. In many cases data are wanting. The evangelists' diagnosis of disease is anything but accurate. They did not know that nervous disorders, peculiarly open to suggestion, often simulate the symptoms of even incurable maladies. There could not be preserved, except in indications, Jesus' ministry of consolation to those whom he did not attempt to heal. To the biographers of Jesus there was no physical ill beyond his power. It is accordant with his tenderness and with his faith, ever dependent upon an impulse from the Father which was not apart from his own sane judgment, that we should to a large extent exchange the sensationalism of the evangelists' accounts of his healings, for an influence of great physical potency indeed, but calming, quieting, strengthening, inspiring, which brings to the sufferer the compassion and love of God, to be received as all-sufficient for health or sickness, for life or death, as the Father wills.

Up to the limit of mind's influence upon the body surged his healing power. Mighty remedial forces were his, majestic personality, its awful holiness transmuted into sympathy and tenderness, faith creative of faith, awakenings in the sick of those reserves of power which men generally do not suspect until the inspiration of a great personality evokes them. Above all was his consciousness of almighty God with him in fatherly compassion which

lifts from the sufferer's soul the burden of unforgiven sin. When we accept from the tradition only the unmiraculous there is no loss but immeasurable gain of an influence whose basis is moral and spiritual.

There is little trace of magical processes in the reports of the healings wrought by Jesus. Few and dubious are references to any material agencies beside the touch which brought him into contact with the sufferer. Magic as coercion of a divine power was unthinkable to him. "He cast out devils" by God's will and without the exorcism of magic word or formula. To call Jesus an exorcist is a misrepresentation. Against insane delusions he brought a sanity of moral and spiritual consciousness mightier than they.

The discriminating study of Jesus' works of healing is the opposite of encouraging to modern therapeutic crazes often mischievous and sometimes fatal. The investigation brings into medical science principles and procedures invaluable to it and to personal completeness of body and mind.

His methods with "the possessed of devils" assumed the current demonology. But he had no superstitious dread of devils. The object of his belief was not devils but the power of God to cast them out. Eliminate the notion of devils and our evaluation of his power upon diseased minds remains unaffected. Jesus did not anticipate our scientific conceptions. He did not live in our scientific universe but in that to which our science is laboriously working, the ordered unity of all things in the One all-dominant and all-pervasive, which we sometimes dare to call God and which he knew and loved as the Father.

Miracle suggests vision and audition, companions with it in the same wonder-world. Few visions are attributed to Jesus in the tradition preserved by the synoptic gospels.

The most notable of these, the dove and voice of the Baptism, the sights and sounds of the Temptation, and not impossibly the Transfiguration, may perhaps be traced to apostolic presentations intended and understood to be picturesque and symbolic. This familiar feature of Jewish instruction, magnificently employed by Jesus, was natural to those who proclaimed him.

In the synoptic reports there is only one mention of a vision or audition in the experience of Jesus during his disciples' companionship with him, and that is the Transfiguration already spoken of. The angel in the Garden is not mentioned in the best New Testament manuscripts.

The words "I saw Satan as lightning fall from heaven" are to be referred to plastic imagination. Only one vision has any possible connection with testimony. Here is a strong argument, though a negative one, for the normality of Jesus' mind.

II

Far more perplexing are the revelations and inspirations which the bearers of the tradition received, they did not doubt, from the exalted Christ, still instructing and directing them. It is often difficult to determine whether a saying attributed to Jesus was spoken by his mortal lips or whether it had this transcendent, or subjective, source.

Traces of this transference are evident in certain passages of our gospels. The reports which have been mentioned in another connection, in the fifth chapter of Mark, the tenth of Matthew, and the tenth of Luke, concerning a mission to the Jewish cities and districts of Palestine, though they may refer to an event in Jesus' ministry, contain elements—not to speak of some of a very different character—which are applicable to an early mission from the Jerusalem church. In Matthew's account occur the

words "Ye shall not have finished the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come"—in marked contrast to another oracle, "The gospel must first be preached to all the nations." Another instance in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew prescribes the treatment of an injurious and stubborn brother Christian, and, even if connected with authentic utterances, has regard to the discipline of an organized church. Akin to this passage are the parables of the tares in the wheat and the fish in the net. Eschatological descriptions in the thirteenth chapter of Mark and its parallels in Matthew and Luke contain elements at least of a later date than the ministry of Jesus, unless we ascribe to him a detailed but inaccurate clairvoyance of future events. Sometimes declarations of this nature are given with a peculiar solemnity, as if to preclude question of them: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Similar phenomena occur in Paul's letters and in other parts of the New Testament. The same derivation is probable in some gospel passages where it is not apparent.

For sympathetic understanding we must transfer ourselves from modern ways of thinking into the consciousness of these ancient men of limited intellectual discipline, of an intensely religious people, and possessed by the conviction of constant connection with the exalted Christ, teaching, guiding, inspiring. What would be to us a religious reflection was to them a word from the beyond. Even logical conclusions and results of discussion could be assigned directly to that higher source, as, in the report contained in the fifteenth chapter of the book of Acts, the issue of a protracted argument is prefaced by the words, "It was decided by the Holy Spirit and us." In such a consciousness the early Christians felt no necessity to discriminate between directive thoughts which they felt to be from their exalted Christ and words which he had

spoken in his mortal life. The former were easily transferred into the tradition of his ministry.

There is an apparent distinction between revelations made to them by the heavenly Christ and inspirations of the Holy Spirit. But the two blended. Both belonged to their life of communion with the exalted Lord. In analogous phenomena of other great religious movements, an inspiration believed to be from a celestial origin is not infrequently intensified into vision of a celestial face, of a form in garments of gleaming white, and the hearing of a voice beyond all music. When one is "in the Spirit" "a door is opened" into the sights and sounds of "Heaven." Then inspiration is blended with that which is received as objective revelation, and the Lord of the revelation with the spirit of the inspiration. Even when the inspiration does not reach this intensity the possibility is latent, and the inspirations are of him who gives the revelations. And every revelation was a thrilling inspiration. Paul's identification, startling to us, of the personal Christ with the universal spirit was the formulation of that which had been felt from the first. In this life of the spirit belong Peter's conversation with Christ, if legendary none the less representative, upon the housetop in Joppa, and the talk of Ananias of Damascus with the Christ who had appeared to Paul on his momentous journey. In this life of the spirit are Paul's "visions and revelations of the Lord."

From Jesus in his earthly ministry his companions had received the powers of his spirit. Now that he is exalted the impartation is conceived to be the same but intensified. From his heaven he pours his spirit upon them in far greater measure than before. These powers were various, of a holy, sacrificial, indomitable life, powers of healing, gifts of tongues, capacities of administration for the needs and the activities of the Christian community. They

included "prophesies," that is inspired utterances, which were received as his thought and direction. "Being at the right hand of God exalted, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this which ye see and hear." All was from Christ. What need of separating out the teachings and guidances of his earthly ministry?

The spiritual gifts of the early Christians were most exercised and their revelations and inspirations from the exalted Christ were most largely received in their religious gatherings. Our most extended description of such a meeting of believers is in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. If this were representative of the Jewish disciples, by whom the tradition was principally formed, that tradition would have been subject to an unbridled fantasy. But the Jewish Christians, unlike those whom Paul tried to repress into a Jewish orderliness, had no reversions to heathen ways. They were not open to such influences as the ecstatic public processions of the mystery cults. Their gatherings were affected by the sober procedures of the synagogue, and their behaviour was disciplined by the ancestral law which they retained. Devoutly, solemnly were announced and received the inspirations of the Lord.

There was no sense of incongruity between these experiences and faith in the one God, though they foreshadowed profound problems of theology and faith. The consciousness of the exalted Christ no more impinged upon the monotheism of Jewish believers than did their earthly companionship with Jesus. Their Aramaic title for him is not that by which they spoke of deity. It is unfortunate that the distinction has been lost in translations. Monotheism's steadiness, calm, concentration, distinguish early Christianity, especially among Jewish adherents, from polytheistic religious phenomena.

Other denizens of the spirit world beside Christ intruded

but little into their experience. Here is an important distinction between early Christianity and religious emotionalisms which have been open to hosts from the world beyond. There was indeed an inherited belief in angels. These beings were pictured in their sacred books as mighty ones standing before God to receive his commands and to be his messengers in the execution of his designs. In the later literature of the Old Testament and in still later Jewish writings angels are also revealers of transcendent mysteries. In the New Testament we find both the growth of an elaborate angelology and protests against it. But among those who formed the tradition of Jesus the function assigned to angels was to do subordinate services. These ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation, knew their place. Not the exalted Lord of a spiritual revelation, but an unobtrusive attendant opened doors for Peter and walked with him a block till he was sure of his way. It was an angelic errand to notify Cornelius of the address of one Simon a tanner; nor did they at the resurrection presume to do more than to give information of what had occurred and to direct to Christ. A model to those who do unassuming personal service is the behaviour of these correct celestial servingmen.

In the peace of God, in the fulfilled companionship of Jesus, were received the revelations and inspirations from him. Memory of the words and deeds of their Lord's ministry on earth regulated their "prophesying," even as it directed their conduct and established their faith. Revelations and inspirations were under the influence of the tradition which was preserved by the gatherings in which their spiritual gifts were exercised. The spirit which filled them they had received from his mortal life. Their impulse and desire was to know his thought more deeply, to grasp more firmly the significance of his actions, for

men's salvation, for the honour of his name and the furtherance of his cause.

The crudeness of the conception is evident, of a Christ spatially removed, pouring down from a distant height that which in reality belongs to humanity's inmost life. But underneath the archaic form we find an accordance with our own holiest experiences. Our faithful love receives the fulness of the revelation of our dearest and best only after they are gone out of our sight. Then their spiritual aims enter our lives as never before. It is a communion in which the personal and the universal are blended. That which is their deepest personal life is recognized as the eternal holy love. Every gift of themselves is impartation of the spirit supreme and universal. Thus it was with the early disciples. When we read of the descent of the spirit from Christ's celestial heights, and the tongues of flame and the miraculous powers, we can penetrate to the reality which is the unity of Christ with the universal spirit, the unity which Paul expressed because he and the early disciples had felt it.

What we modern men would describe in conscious processes of thought if we imagine ourselves in their situation, was expressed by them as revelation and inspiration. As our reflections would be tested by what we had seen and heard of Jesus so were their experiences tested. Our reflections would be necessary for the continuance of his power in our lives. They sought it in their different way; and the advantage would not be altogether with our way. Their confidence in what they ecstatically received and proclaimed, and which makes so difficult the identification of Jesus' actual words and deeds, was necessary to the vitality of the tradition, which the revelations and inspirations obscured. Thus they continued that life which is supreme among the lives of earth on into the advancing life of humanity. Jesus in his consummate wisdom had

refrained from any mechanical method of securing a repressive transcript of his acts and teachings, preferring to connect his impartations with human life's expanding uses of them.

Because the tradition lived it grew; and because it grew it lived. Whatever the source of these experiences of the early believers, they entered human thought and were subject to the obscurations that always beset human thought. They were expressed in words which change their content and color as they pass from mind to mind. They were attended by emotions without which they would have had no life, by hopes and fears and loves. The recipients were of an age and people and the ideas, desires, and passions of that age and people affected the apprehension of everything spiritually received, or supposed to be, from their Lord. And the early church had its own peculiarities, and within it were idiosyncrasies of groups and individuals. Into an obscuring, distorting medium came the revelations and inspirations. But they brought Christ in, his love, his faith, his holiness, his heroic sacrifice, even the very spirit and revelation of their Lord. The modern attempt to learn the historic Jesus does not involve the assumption that the only Christ we have is he of the earthly ministry, and that experiences of the exalted and ever-living Christ are merely subjective, to be eliminated from Christianity together with the reflections and faiths involved in them.

The problem which the early Christians have imposed upon us implies far-reaching issues. We apply to it every resource of critical investigation. We analyze and trace back the various sources of our gospels. But even the apostolic source is affected, who can say how much? We distinguish in the sayings and doings attributed to Jesus, down to the last details of them, those things which betray the influence of later conditions or conceptions, and

on the other hand we mark deeds and words which are evidently inseparable from his career. But when we have exhausted every resource, availed ourselves of light from every quarter, the evidence is far from covering all the ground. So close is the connection of word and deed that the acts of Jesus are also obscured. Here appears the value, the necessity of that which has been commended as the chief criterion of essential authenticity. To discover the aims of Jesus is to find him. A consistent expression of his aims, in his followers' experience of him who for them had died and liveth evermore, has the practical authenticity which our service needs, and enlarges, deepens and vitalizes our apprehension of him.

III

Their Christ died and rose again. As one who looks at a mountain through a cloud that is irradiated by a rainbow, so they viewed Jesus' ministry through his cross and resurrection.

So must his ministry, his life, himself, ever be interpreted. The cross in the inseparable unity of death and life, attained through and in the cross, has not been emphasized too much through the Christian ages, but essentials of that significance have been neglected. There has been a separation between the cross and the ministry consummated in the cross. We have made two of that which is one, and have lost the significance which is in that unity. There is also a loss in "plans of salvation." Equally superficial is that modern fashion of thinking which makes us prefer the story of his previous ministry, or his precepts isolated from this their supreme meaning, to his cross, life-achieving and life-imparting. There is no understanding of Jesus' words and aims except in the light of this culmination. There is no following and imitation of Jesus

which is not the life of his resurrection in the fellowship of his sufferings. There is no life for any man save that life through death. There is no other reconstruction of social humanity, no other way to the attainment of the real Christendom. This is the essential of every personal social good.

Our question at this point is, how the original Christian consciousness of cross and resurrection affected the formation of the tradition. The truth and power of their emphasis did not exclude the growth of unhistoric elements. Especially serious was the influence of conceptions that have injuriously affected the understanding of Jesus even to this day. We shall be brought to the most difficult problem of the reconstructive criticism of the New Testament.

The early Christian conception of the cross was affected by an argument that was superficial, literalistic and mechanical. It was their apology for their Master's death, their contention that his crucifixion, instead of disproving his Messiahship, established it. Their argument was not that his death is the revelation of the highest human, the deepest divine, the realization of the life eternal in him and from him, but was based upon a misuse of passages of the Old Testament, by exegetical methods current then, discredited now. Such polemic covers over the real and vital things.

The astounding announcement of Jesus' resurrection as Christ, "whereof we are witnesses," opened the question, Why was he crucified? The early disciples changed this "stumbling block of the cross" into the assertion that thus it must be. Scripture, they "opened and alleged," had foretold it, and whatever was foretold by scripture must be. Therefore whatever passages could be so applied were ingeniously employed, and we find in our evangelists that the detailed reports of his death were controlled by them.

No remembrance of Jesus' death rested upon apostolic testimony. "They fled." The apologetic interest was stronger than whatever witness was available. In the tradition as Mark gives it, and in the derivations from Mark in the other synoptic gospels (the fourth gospel's account is moulded by deeper thought) the story of the crucifixion is constructed from the Old Testament. There is a reproduction of passages taken especially from the twenty-second psalm, knit together by incidents to which they might apply and by obvious general statements of procedure at a crucifixion, with a few minor historic reminiscences, as of Simon the cross-bearer and the women looking on from a distance, and legendary accretions: "the vail of the temple was rent," and "there was darkness over all the land." It is strange that any should draw either historical conclusions or theological doctrines from the details of a narrative so formed. The words omitted by Luke, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthanei," "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!" which are the opening words of an Aramaic rendering of the twenty-second psalm, justify no dogma, and no romantic invention that Jesus' faith failed at the last. The spirit in which he met his death may be learned better from the prayer in Gethsemane. That report, of evident apostolic testimony, excludes elements which distorted the story of the crucifixion.

Yet there were witnesses, among them the faithful women and probably Simon of Cyrene. Luke's additions to Mark's account suggest a connection with their testimony. They are at least drawn from the faith and love of Jesus. They are in a different universe from Mark's constructions. The physical horrors are taken up into an incomparable spiritual majesty. The agony becomes the eternal victory of heroism perfect in gentleness, patience, faith and love. We need no resurrection vision to

assure us of life eternal in the welcome of the vilest into his celestial companionship. Expressive of him is the prayer, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," and the compassion which turned from his own impending tortures to the ultimate woes of motherhood outraged by the same malignities that wrought his death. We need no manuscript evidence to attribute to his soul the prayer for the forgiveness of his executioners. Here are insights into the way he died.

Finer conceptions of Jesus' death than those of Mark appear in the intimate life of the church in Jerusalem. These were affected by the expectation of his speedy coming. That which was central in the Church's life combined the tenderest memory with the most fervent hope.

That centre was the religious meal. Every eating and drinking, in a group larger or smaller, was a religious observance. Their distribution of goods made larger groups, as they "broke bread together from house to house." This was the precursor of the sacrament of the eucharist, which separated from this spontaneous remembrance of Jesus certain elements of it and formulated and elaborated them.

From the beginning, when Christians ate together the thought of Christ was dominant. In "the prayers" at "the breaking of bread" the most fervent supplication was that which spread early through Christian communities, Gentile and Jewish, "Marana tha, Our Lord come." Christ is the great master of the coming feast in his glorious kingdom, and of its frugal anticipations. Every meal was a "rejoicing."

The leaders of the church had often broken bread with Jesus. The overwhelmingly impressive instance was his Last Supper with his disciples, and that was a memory inseparable from his death. That memory mingled with the informal, spontaneous anticipations of the later sacra-

mental observance. It is difficult to determine what words and acts of Jesus at the Last Supper were preserved through the simple meals on into the formal rite. Our principal sources of information, Paul (in First Corinthians 11, 23–27) Mark, apparently dependent on Paul, and Matthew's slightly elaborated reproduction of Mark, the genuine text of Luke, from which the unquestionably ungenuine interpolation must be distinguished, and that early Christian manual, The Teaching of the Apostles, present such variances as to make it evident that early Christianity had no universally prescribed form for the observance of the eucharist. The last two sources have no reference to "the new covenant in my blood." It is a question whether Paul's account of the Last Supper was derived from one of his "visions and revelations." With no fixed tradition to check him, the affirmative answer has the stronger argument.

Commonly associated with that phrase are the words, "and to give his life a ransom for many." This is also open to question, not only because of the lack of other similar expressions in the gospels, but also because the sentence in which it occurs is complete without it, and more harmonious with the context, and because it may have been suggested from Pauline or Jewish sources or from both. The apology for a treatment of the two controversial texts that seems too summary is this: "ransom for many," "new covenant in my blood," if spoken by Christ may well have been symbolic, not in the theological use of that word.

But the session of the court cannot close before we summon the most important witness to give direct testimony to the early Christian conception of the meaning of Christ's death; and this witness is Paul. His thoughts on this subject may conceivably have been derived from Jewish and pagan sources which evidently affected him. But

closer than these relations were his intimacies with early Christianity, to which also the Jewish thought was open. Paul states clearly that the original tradition, assumed to be accepted by his readers, was that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." If we question whether these words were his own insertion, the answer is in the courses of his arguments generally. The saving sacrificial death of Christ is not the goal of his arguments, but their postulate, assumed to be already accepted by his readers, to be essential to the Christian faith, not a reflective addition to it but its very substance.

This weight of Pauline testimony to the original Christian faith is reinforced by the earliest Christian use of the scriptures to substantiate their claims for Christ. Even if there were no early traces of the citation, for that purpose, of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah as applicable to their Lord, its omission from their arguments would be inconceivable. Nor could this passage have seemed to them exceptional. These Christian Jews lived in the very atmosphere of the temple services, and the sacrificial conceptions concerning them were fortified by many a scripture passage applicable to their Christ.

Into their remembrances of Jesus this conviction entered. As they broke bread together remembering his Last Supper with his disciples, their devotion to their Lord, who had lived for them, who was pouring forth his revelations and inspirations upon them, and for whose glorious coming they longed and prayed, was consummated in love for him who had died for their salvation. This devotion to their Lord who had showed them the Father was not encumbered with dogmatic formulations of an angry deity who must be appeased.

Can we trace this sacrificial—no less than atoning consciousness—into the heart of Christ? If it were not so he would have been the unaccountable exception to the holy,

loving souls who have suffered in devotion to their God and their brother men. Even in the depths of our own hearts, as we climb "the world's great altar stairs," we know that our sufferings, so far as sacrifice is in them, are not merely individual. Not only are the results of them for other men, but in the sacrificial sufferings themselves we are not alone. In them our fellow men are embraced, in that unity which makes all human sorrows one; and the redemption which our pain works for us is not in ourselves alone. A still deeper mystery of suffering is then revealed, even of that universal heart which by its sacrifice saves unto the uttermost, working through all consecrated souls the redemption consummated by the cross of Christ.

Therefore we recognize in our earliest brethren that meaning of the cross which formulations have laboured vainly to express, for its depth is beneath all depth and its height is above all height. And we also recognize in them the reflection of the sacrificial heart of Christ.

IV

We read "that Christ was buried, and that he was raised the third day according to the scriptures, and that he was seen by Cephas, then by the twelve. Then he was seen by more than five hundred brethren at once. Then he was seen by James, then by the apostles all." This our earliest record of the resurrection appearances of Jesus, evidently consisting of two sequences not perfectly adjusted, one beginning with Peter and the other with James, is the prelude of the great Easter chapter, the fifteenth of First Corinthians. Paul repeats this account, he says, as he received it, cites it as familiar to his readers, unquestioned by them, attested by the apostles and many other witnesses. He bases upon it his argument against a

limitation of the eternal hope to those who are alive at Christ's glorious coming. That error, he labours to prove, is inconsistent with the unquestioned resurrection of Christ. We have here the tradition of the Jerusalem church in an early form, known and accepted by Christians generally.

The tradition as Paul repeated it is a brief synopsis. Each vision to which he refers had its own details. Out of these and from other visions grew legends of appearances of Jesus after his death. Any vision of the risen Lord by any visionary was acceptable to the faith of all. As in such occurrences generally, which have been innumerable in all times and climes and are frequent in our own time and land, the recollections of the visions expanded in the minds of those who had experienced them. What was vague became detailed. What had been an overwhelming feeling of an immortal presence formulated itself in the telling. Visions are contagious; they can be seen by more than five hundred at one time. The visions seen by various persons adjusted themselves to one another, though by no means with complete consistency. Unconscious connections were formed between them and became established in the general tradition.

Our evangelists give us but a little of this tradition, as it had grown, partly in their own thoughts, at the date of their writing; generally selecting the elements most beautiful and impressive, as the communion at Emmaus; yet with sensational incidents and crass material conceptions, as in the sequel to Christ at Emmaus: "Handle me and see that a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye observe I have. And they gave him a piece of broiled fish and he took it and ate before them."

That the disciples of Jesus had visions of him soon after the resurrection is as unquestionable to us as it was to Paul, not only because of the attestation, but also because

all the history of the early church, therefore all Christian history, presupposes them. The simplest explanation of vision applies here: an inner experience that projects itself into sense perception. Only the nature and origin of the inner experience is important.

The familiar argument that these revelations must have had an external cause because the consternation and despair of those who forsook him and fled, giving up all as lost, excludes the believing capacity for the subjective vision, overlooks, among other things, the devotion of those who did not forsake him and whose love and faith and consequent beholding were communicated to those of inferior faith and love. Woman's faith at its supreme attainment is determined by its object, not by what befalls its object. Misfortune, disaster, intensify her faith no less than they deepen her love. Women are also peculiarly liable to psychic experiences, and peculiarly receptive to spiritual realities which they may express. The tradition, in all the forms which are given in the gospels, sets women at the beginning of the resurrection story. In some forms of the tradition their sight of the risen Christ is diminished to "a vision of angels which said that he was alive." Obviously it was inconvenient to base the resurrection upon women's testimony, generally discredited in that age and land. But what concern had these women with angels when their hearts were one devoted passion for their Lord? Impossible that their faculty of vision so directed could have stopped at any substitute.

Weak is the claim that no fact of history is more securely established than is Jesus' corporeal resurrection and spatial manifestation. The evidence is of the same character as proofs alleged for wild and crude religious imaginings in every age and clime. So falls every attempt to base the spiritual upon the physical. These failures

direct us to the nobler, purer effort of discovering the vindication of the spiritual in the spiritual itself. Here science serves faith by making every way impassable except the one way of the spirit, the path which science cannot follow, because it is in a higher realm than hers. Before its entrance she stops with folded hands.

Faith in the crucified and risen Christ made that little company of his companions conquerors of the world, leaders of humanity into a new earth and a new heaven experienced even on earth. The conviction that humanity's supreme representative has conquered death is the vindication of the eternal life of every soul that allies itself with him, living his life eternal on earth and beyond. Yet the visions infected faith with inferior and essentially alien elements. They led into regions of mist which Christianity has not yet groped through.

From the visionary reflection of their inward experience of the living Christ the disciples drew two conclusions detrimental to Christianity. The second to be cited is, from its effect upon the tradition of Jesus' career, almost bewildering to our efforts to learn his words and deeds and life. These two conclusions of theirs are not additions to the original tradition which we might then distinguish from them, but they affected it from the beginning.

The first,—that Jesus' body was raised from the dead. They were Jews and the Jewish expectation of the hereafter had not extricated itself from the physical. The aspirations of the noblest of the psalms toward life in the eternal God, which are fulfilled in the great word, "All live unto him," had faded before the crude assertive dogma which is instanced in the Maccabean apocalypse called the book of Daniel: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." The Jewish doctrine of immortality, though it included an intermediate state, was fixed upon the bodily resurrection. The inconsist-

encies, impossibilities and absurdities were passed over, as in our burial liturgies.

To these Jewish disciples the consummation which others are finally to receive became Christ's on the third day after his death,—"according to the scriptures." His body, they believed, was raised from the dead. That which they saw in vision was, according to indications in the Transfiguration story and elsewhere, an appearance of gleaming light in face and form, as with such phenomena generally. Yet their Jewish conception made it the body risen from the tomb.

Evidently the dead body of Jesus disappeared, not improbably consigned to the common grave of those executed by Roman law, and to be rescued from that desecration by reverent legend. But this conjecture is only the most probable. What became of our Lord's earthly tabernacle the world will never know. What becomes of ours we need not care.

Their other conclusion, which is of great import, was that the Jesus whom they saw alive after his passion is the Christ who is to come again to earth in power and glory. This was to them the vision's supreme significance, not his immortality nor the blessedness of a good man gone. As orthodox Jews they needed no assurance there.

The vision of a great and holy soul intensely loved beholds beauty, blessedness, majesty ineffable. Every memory, devotion and hope for the adored beloved furnishes materials intensified, glorified. The content of such a vision includes, in the experience, and still more in memories and transmissions, whatever can exalt it, though these contributions be from widely different sources, not logically connected, sometimes incongruous with one another. If Jesus had been known to them as the Christ, and that we shall find to be established, then all accessible conceptions of the Christ, whether from Jesus or from other

sources, united in their visionary conception and in their proclamation of him. Within this range was the Jewish hope of the speedy coming of the reign and kingdom of God on earth. They needed no influence of Jewish apocalyptic literature to enable them to make this connection. When this influence was felt and as far as it was felt it affected the elaborations and formulations of their expectation of Christ's glorious coming in his kingdom. Oh, that he might come speedily! Marana tha, Our Lord come!

The early days of Christianity were spent in expectation. The longing for the speedy realization of an intense hope is almost inseparable from the hope itself. He might come at any moment. When he tarried long in his heaven at the right hand of the Father they felt as from him spiritual inspirations telling them what must intervene before his coming. Such inspired utterances coloured the tradition of his ministry. They stand in the record of the evangelists side by side with earlier admonitions to watch for him continuously, for ye know not at what hour he may come.

This obsession so permeates the record of the evangelists, is expressed so often in words ascribed to Jesus, that it has seemed to a recent majority of New Testament scholars that Jesus shared this conception and expectation. But at present the difficulties and incongruities of this interpretation and its evident contradictions of words and acts of Jesus have ranged a very eminent scholarship against it. A more extensive and accurate knowledge of Jewish life and thought in Jesus' day opposes this interpretation. Fundamental and far-reaching issues are involved. The eighth chapter will be devoted to this question.

The problem demands the application of our fundamental critically constructive principle, that our knowl-

edge of Jesus is by the discovery of the aims of Jesus. For the more thorough use of this principle we now follow the history of the tradition of Jesus' ministry into the formation of the immediate sources of our gospels and into the gospels themselves.

CHAPTER V

SOURCES AND GOSPELS

Earlier than the testimony of the gospels to Jesus was the witness of Paul. Letters of his of an authenticity accepted by all accredited scholarship have established beyond reasonable question not only the historicity but also the surpassing greatness of Jesus. Whatever the influence upon Paul from his Gentile environment, his fundamental impression was formed from Jesus himself, through the Master's companions, and in his own spiritual experience. The testimony of Paul's genuine letters leads us to the gospel records with the assurance of the Jesus of moral and spiritual sublimity and redemptive power.

I

The tradition of Jesus' ministry passed into written forms. From written sources were largely compiled our synoptic gospels. The question of the fourth gospel's historic knowledge beyond that which it derived from the others is variously estimated by scholars. There is at present a thorough attempt to discover its connections with the early tradition, and to examine whether there may not be in it corrective historic additions to that which we have in the synoptics. That reminiscences which are not reported by the other evangelists continued to the time of the writing of the fourth gospel is unquestionable from the nature of the case, and the attempt to trace some of them there is most alluring. On the other hand, what has the appearance of an historic contribution may be derived from the conceptions of the evangelist or from

the conditions of his day. With all hopeful appreciation for the undertaking it may be best to regard it as still largely undecided. A similar critically conservative attitude is taken toward fragmentary documents that purport to give words and acts of Jesus. Whether more or less historic, that sublime gospel is a spiritual interpretation of Jesus, expressive of disciples' experiences of the exalted Lord which are transferred into his earthly ministry. It is the consummate development of the revelations and inspirations which have been described and estimated in the preceding chapter. In this high office it is invaluable, indispensable. The ministry of Jesus must be read in the light of profoundest experiences of the ever-living Christ.

If we read Matthew and Luke immediately after Mark (it is convenient to speak of the gospels by their traditional names, whoever wrote them) we often find ourselves upon familiar ground. Nearly all of Mark is incorporated, with emendations, into Matthew, and a large part of it into Luke. It is not necessary for our purpose to discuss the question whether Matthew and Luke used Mark substantially as we have it or an earlier version of it. The former of these two views is the more acceptable to present scholarship.

If we then read Matthew and Luke in course, another interrelation of the two becomes evident. They coincide in certain other material beside that which they derive from Mark. About one sixth of each gospel is unquestionably from another source used by both. For example the two temptation stories are similar. Much of Matthew's "Sermon on the Mount" is distributed through Luke, and there are many other parallels. There is no traceable dependence of either gospel upon the other, except apparent dependences due to harmonizing copyists.

It has become the virtually unanimous judgment of modern scholarship that this common fund, additional to

these two gospels' use of Mark, is from a written source, originally Aramaic, but taken by our gospels from a Greek translation. If it were an oral source or directly from a written source in another language the similarities could not have been so close. The Greek of these parallel passages indicates an Aramaic original.

Further use of written sources in the synoptics is antecedently probable where we cannot check them so clearly, though some immediate derivations from oral tradition are not necessarily excluded. Before examining in the following sections of this chapter the sources mentioned and others, a few remarks on the evangelists' use of sources in general may be useful. They followed the custom of their time, copied where they pleased, amending as they pleased, without acknowledgment or apology. The nature and origin of these written sources generally is indicated by Luke's reference, in his introduction, to a considerable number of writings concerning Jesus and the beginnings of Christianity. The employment of sources leaves considerable scope for the compiling author, in choice and arrangement of materials, in omissions, emendations, supplementary statements and summaries, explanations, reflections and interpretations,—often blended with the sources.

For the purpose of learning what Jesus said and did and was, the sources are obviously more important than the compilers' manipulation of them. A reading of the synoptic gospels without an analysis and examination of the sources which compose them is inadequate. Influences which affected the sources, as has been described in the preceding chapters, are peculiarly important.

Sources and gospels kept the purpose and spirit which, as already emphasized, characterized the tradition from the beginning. The object was not historic instruction (even in Luke's historic consciousness that purpose was

subordinate) but edification of faith and life. "These things are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name." The necessity, for this purpose, of writings which told of Jesus' words and deeds was felt increasingly with the postponement of his expected coming and the aging or decease of the witnesses of his ministry. Converts' need of instruction has suggested an earlier date than is required by the considerations just mentioned. Translation into Greek must follow, for those who needed the translation. Gospels written in Greek for Greek-speaking peoples naturally used such translations of sources. This consideration holds even if any of the gospels were first written in Aramaic.

II

We come to a summary examination of the sources. Mark has to be regarded both as itself a gospel and also as a source of other gospels. Mark also is a compilation of sources. The widespread tradition of the early church that behind Mark stand Peter's reminiscences, which Mark wrote down, is too strong and reasonable to be rejected, though it must evidently be amended. Not everything in Mark is from the great apostle. There are passages which treat of events where Peter was not a witness, as the account of the crucifixion. There are others which cannot be ascribed to his authority without making his testimony so poor that it would lose value, and the ancient tradition of his relation to Mark would be deprived of much of its significance. The widely varying qualities of Mark's reports are evident. Thus evident are the different values of his sources. Though we may not venture to define in Mark's gospel the precise limits of Peter's testimony, we recognize him repeatedly. We are

brought as into the Master's presence, seeing his actions, sometimes even to the very expression of his face, overwhelmed by his words, drawn by his irresistible attraction so that we also cannot but leave all and follow him. Consistent with what we know of the mind and heart of the great apostle and with the influence of Jesus upon him who having once denied his Master, received power from him for immeasurable devotion to take up the cross and to follow him, are Mark's tremendous heroic passages.

More concerning Mark's selection and use of sources can be said when a little later we examine his idiosyncrasies. We note at this point that everything was congenial to him which presented Jesus in the light of the expected glorious appearing. Stories of Jesus' mighty works on earth were therefore acceptable to him, so that he sometimes leads us through a succession of wonder-tales. In marked contrast are those reports in Mark which may be traced to a written source or sources possessing that second mentioned material which is especially evident in parallel passages of Matthew and Luke.

This material, conveniently called non-Markan as not derived from Mark, consists largely of sayings attributed to Jesus. A list may be found useful of the non-Markan passages common to the two evangelists, as they occur in Matthew and Luke respectively. In this list, substantially following Harnack, chapters are designated by Roman numerals, verses by common numerals. The letters *a* and *b* after a common numeral stand for the first or second part of a verse.

Luke III. 3, 7–9, 16, 17.
IV. 1–13.
VI. 17, 20–23, 27–33, 35*b*–44, 46–49.
VII. 1–10, 18–28, 31–35.
IX. 2, 57–60.
X. 2, 3, 5–7*b*, 12–16, 21, 22, 23*b*, 24.

Luke	XI.	2–4, 9–14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23–26, 29–35, 39, 42, 44, 46–52.
	XII.	2–10, 22–31, 33, 34, 39, 40, 42–46, 51, 53, 58, 59.
	XIII.	18–21, 24, 28, 29, 34, 35.
	XIV.	11, 26, 27, 34, 35.
	XV.	4–7.
	XVI.	13, 16–18.
	XVII.	1, 3, 4, 6, 23, 24, 26, 27, 33–35.
	XIX.	26.
	XXII.	28, 30.
Matt.	III.	5, 7–12.
	IV.	1–11.
	V.	2, 4, 6, 11–13, 15, 18, 25, 26, 32, 39, 40, 42, 44–48.
	VI.	9–13, 19–33.
	VII.	1–5, 7–14, 16–18, 21, 24–28.
	VIII.	5–12, 19–22.
	IX.	37, 38.
	X.	7, 10*b*, 12, 13, 15, 16*a*, 24–40.
	XI.	2–13, 16–19, 21–23, 25–27.
	XII.	22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 38, 39, 41–45.
	XIII.	16, 17, 31–33.
	XV.	14.
	XVII.	20*b*.
	XVIII.	7, 12, 13, 15, 21, 22.
	XIX.	28.
	XXIII.	4, 12, 13, 23, 25, 27, 29, 30–32, 34–39.
	XXIV.	26–28, 37–41, 43–51.
	XXV.	29.

This material is sometimes called "The Sayings of Jesus." Sometimes by a corresponding Greek word, "Logia." But these names have other uses, and are not adequate. There are passages which are not exclusively sayings, though for the sake of sayings. The usage now approved recognizes these parallel passages as representing a more extended source, containing narrative elements also, which is called Q, the first letter of the German word

for source, Quelle. The synoptic gospels, including Mark, contain passages additional to those in the above list which are of the same general quality as they. Where such passages cannot be assigned to other origins and influences they are to be recognized as of the same or similar Q origin as those in the list.

It is evident that this source Q was for the instruction of believers, to give them the thoughts of Jesus. Here is a close connection with the apostolic ministry. Dominant in this ministry was the apostle Peter. The connection of these teachings with this man, just how close we cannot say, throws additional light upon Peter's thought and character, whose greatness has been too much obscured by our larger knowledge of Paul.

What we have from this source is invaluable for our knowledge of the ethical and spiritual consciousness of Jesus. Its ethics are unconcessive, for the absolute sovereignty of the good. There is no casuistry, even in the better sense of that word. There is no admission that a conflict of duties is ever possible. All are of the one perfect will of God. Its righteousness is of the inner life controlling all actions. Thoughts and feelings are judged as uncompromisingly as deeds. Hateful and impure desires are as murder and adultery. The good to be served is independent of material things, and the reward of the service is not in them. Yet life's common goods are the gifts of divine love. There is no asceticism. The sorrows of life are real sorrows. There is no Stoic apathy or self-sufficiency. There is the human appeal to sympathy and helpfulness. The righteous life is to be realized in the common affairs of men. There is no aloofness, no indifference to ordinary responsibilities. Except in passages inconsistent with its prevalent teaching there is no censoriousness, while its moral judgments are "sharper than any two-edged sword, and vital to discern the thoughts and intents

of the heart." The Jewish law is presupposed, but a merely external conformity has no value. Here is conflict with every formalism. There is no moral height too arduous, no moral task too difficult, no test of suffering or persecution too severe for the devoted, heroic soul. Yet there is no rigidity. It is the ethic of gentleness, gratuitous service, unlimited forbearance and forgiveness that diffuse love as God sends down his rain and sunshine upon the evil and the good. It is the noblest, calmest, most searching and convincing morality ever written. Such sublime teachers as Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius are great for their paler resemblances to it. And the same is true of ethical leaders of other civilizations.

It is illimitably inspirational, for its ethic is altogether religious. The absolute good is the divine will. That will is perfect righteousness and all-inclusive love. The obedience is to the Father, free consecration and adoration of the devoted, trustful, happy child. No anxiety distracts from the service of God. Prayer is this morality's vital breath, as humble as confiding, never with overstrained exaltations of the presumptuous, self-indulgent type of mysticism. As its ethic is altogether religious so is its religion altogether ethical. The Father is the standard for all acts, thoughts, feelings, aims.

Prominent is the kingdom of God. Matthew's phrase, the kingdom of Heaven, Jewishly reverent in its avoidance of the divine name, has the same meaning. The translation "the reign of God," expresses more of the spirit of the original, emphasizing the divine action rather than its result, but the reign involves the kingdom. The kingdom of the Father's reign is both of the future and of the present, though the eschatological interpretation of Jesus' career and teachings tries to resist the plain meanings. Whether the different representations can be reconciled with one another is another question. It is the kingdom of Christ's

second coming. It is also in the hearts and lives of men. It is accordant with his victory over the realm of Satan.

A conception of Jesus is presented which is remote from later dogmatic theology. There is no pre-existence, no virgin birth. As interpreter of the Father's thought and agent of the Father's will Jesus is the Son of God, pre-eminently and representatively. In the complete prophetic endowment which constitutes him he is the Christ. To his fulfilments were directed the divine work and revelation in Israel. In Jesus' ministry the desire of the holy men of old is achieved. John the Baptist's epochal work is for his work. To reject his words is to reject God and salvation. To receive him is to receive him that sent him. To hear and to do his sayings is to build upon the foundation from which no storms and floods can ever sweep away. From this source there is a great passage, whether taken from Jesus' own words or a Christian reflection, but even then not beyond Jesus' deepest filial consciousness of himself and his mission, that all things are delivered to him by the Father, that none but the Father knows him, and that the Father is known only by him and those to whom he wills to reveal the Father. No other affection may draw away from Jesus. He demands the love of immeasurable loyalty. That love and loyalty to him is for the Father and the Father's purpose.

For knowledge of the real Jesus this collection is invaluable. Whatever added reflections it may contain, whatever elements from the revelations and spiritual inspirations which so largely moulded the tradition, these are for the most part intimate connections, inevitable developments from Jesus' career and teachings. Where it differs from other sources its claims are generally the stronger and its materials the more important for the understanding of him.

The attempt to assign this source to a date that makes

it too late for immediate connection with the apostolic tradition is, as scholars generally agree, inconsistent with its qualities and with its general independence of influences from Gentile Christianity, and also brings the date of the gospels which reproduce it later than is historically possible. The resemblance of the best tendencies of the later Stoicism which have their expression in men like Epictetus and the great ruler of the Roman world (though the resemblances are less significant than the differences) involves no dependence either way. The spirit of truth and life is not confined. This was an epoch when noblest souls in different places and conditions were peculiarly responsive to the mind of God.

There is a real relation of the thoughts of this source to contemporary Jewish thought. The principal reason for this relation is that Jesus was the supreme representative of the best Jewish teaching of his time. He was not concerned for his own originality. His consciousness of direct reception from the Father did not at all lessen his receptiveness to the teachers of Israel, either of the remote or of the recent past, or of his own day. Their aspirations, in his transcendent appropriations of them, were the Father's gifts to him. He and other great Jewish teachers reverenced the same sacred writings, the same revealing history, drawing living water from the same springs of salvation. It is no disparagement of him to recognize that he and the best of Jewish contemporaries thought along similar lines, sought related aims. Resemblances of many of his words to the greatest of theirs, even when the priority is theirs, is a mighty attestation to the one spirit of truth and life. It is through this recognition that we come to his supremacy, in larger emancipations from the formal and external, in spirituality unmixed with lower things, in unity of purpose, in the concentration of divine forces in his ministry and personality.

In Luke there appears another source as valuable in some respects as this. Representative of it are the parable inadequately named The " Prodigal Son " and the account of the woman who anointed Jesus' feet. This passage is not derived from Mark's account of the anointing at Bethany, from which the most significant features of Luke's report are absent.

The source which is thus represented may not have been a written source. If it were, the omission from Matthew of recognizable traces of it would be perplexing. The style is as if a man of literary genius had taken reports directly given to him by the talk of friends. The very fineness and exquisiteness of these recollections may have limited their retention and currency to those endowed with a rare spiritually artistic appreciation. Nor were they so obviously adapted as Q to the instruction of new disciples.

A possibility to be considered is suggested by the literary method which Luke shared with ancient historians, of composing speeches out of the author's own judgment of what his characters might have said under given circumstances. This procedure meets us in the book of Acts. But there are indications that the author of Luke and Acts recorded as far as he could what was actually spoken. And for him as for all Christians the words of Jesus had unique sacredness. In the first two chapters of his gospel, whatever their origins, he was under no such constraint. In the inaugural at Nazareth indeed we recognize the evangelist's free composition. But this passage is exceptional in nature and content. It is his interpretation of the purpose of Jesus' ministry to his own people and to the world. Even in this passage there are echoes of the voice of Jesus.

Of this source generally it can be said, that a man of literary genius and spiritual insight must indeed amend the reports given him, with the purpose of rendering more

adequately the original thought. The magnificent result attests the success of his endeavour. Reminiscences of popular anecdotes and proverbial sayings are neither strange nor significant. When every allowance is made, the final estimate of the relation of Jesus to a large part of this Luke's source must be: To what other Christ can these teachings be attributed? In the events narrated what other Christ is revealed?

The redemptive Lucan parables include: The "Prodigal Son," rather "The Forgiving Father," with its climax of insistence that the Father's redeeming love must become the soul of human brotherhood, "The Lost Sheep," in Luke's superior version, "The Lost Piece of Silver," "The Pharisee and the Publican." There is also a redemptive record of events. The woman who was a sinner rises in her grateful, transforming love above the correctness of a censorious piety, when she washes Jesus' feet with the precious ointment and her more precious tears, and kisses his feet and wipes them with her hair,—to be graciously and honourably dismissed with Jesus' reverent appreciation of her homage. In Luke's story of the Crucifixion, formed from Jesus' heart, even if not a record of actual events, Jesus' assurance of salvation to the most wretched penitent continues his redemptive toils into his dying agonies.

The dominant quality of this portion of Luke is Christ's passion to seek and to save the lost. This motive is indeed pervasive of the gospels generally, as throughout the New Testament. Christianity is the consummate religion of redemption. But here is an incomparable intensity. Exultant is heaven's joy over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance. The forgiveness, which restores to God's heart the child who had torn himself from it, is the divine passion. Every praise to God for omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience, pales before this revelation of il-

limitable love. Into this every conception of God must be transfigured. The problem of life, world, universe, delivers its key to the soul which knows that fatherhood. The meaning and mission of Jesus are unveiled. He is the divine love, toiling and suffering to the uttermost that it may save. What other Christology is needed? The essential nature of humanity is disclosed, with its task and destiny. God's supreme blessedness is revealed in the words: "This my son was dead and is alive again: he was lost and is found."

God's forgiving love needs no motive outside itself. There is no scheme nor plan in the father's welcome of the son who had wronged and forsaken him and who casts himself solely and directly upon the father's mercy, which he finds to be inconceivable affection. There is no possibility of an interior rivalry in God between love and justice which must be somehow appeased. This is the opposite of depreciation of the cross, which is exalted into the heart of all-forgiving, all-suffering love. God does not forgive because Christ died, but Christ died because God forgives. In the cross is God's highest revelation, the consummation of his sacrificial redemptive power.

Faith in God's forgiving love implies faith in men, God's faith in men. The unfilial son returns from the far country of riotous living and desperate misery, to confess his sin, to ask nothing but the relief of intolerable woes, and the father recognizes in this motive life from death, receptiveness for complete restoration. The publican, standing afar off, who would not lift so much as his eyes to heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, "God be merciful to me the sinner," is, in how pregnant a comparison with the self-satisfied Pharisee, not only justified but exalted. The appeal of the robber on the cross (for this narrative is at least derived from the thought and heart of Jesus) opens to him nothing less than companionship

this day with Christ in Paradise, which means the highest heaven. There is no depth of sin and loss where the appeal of the divine love cannot be heard: there is no blessedness and glory above the reach of the forgiven soul. In another aspect of this faith in men, Jesus discerns in an outcast a man worthy to be his host, and Zacchaeus' forthright declaration of his conduct in his hated trade vindicates Jesus' appreciation. Our Lord's transformation of the question, "Who is my neighbour?" into the revelation of what it is to be a neighbour, has for its answer the Samaritan. In this parable and in the other parables and incidents of this source are disclosed the practical, serviceable results of the redemptive love of God in the common life and relations of men.

The demand for repentance is nowhere else more urgent, repentance which turns the whole man Godward in humble, unhesitant, obedient, loving faith. To the woman who loved much Jesus said, "Thy faith hath saved thee." The only claim urged by the penitent is the eternal fatherhood, as Jesus' life and death bring its reality to men. This requirement of repentance is implicit in the divine love, which, as love, does not force itself upon any soul. Salvation is ethical from its beginning, with moral responsibility for the eternal destiny. Sin has never been expressed more searchingly than in that light of the supreme fatherhood which shines in the great parable.

The conflict between Jesus and many of the religious leaders of the people goes even deeper than to divergent apprehensions of Israel's law. There are opposite judgments of humanity, fundamentally different attitudes toward those who seemed too low and vile for salvation. The irreconcilable antagonism was rooted in Jesus' passion to seek and to save that which is lost.

In this part of Luke, as throughout his work in his gospel and in Acts, Jesus' discovery of womanhood is

prominent. The psychology is penetrating and exquisite. Women, who appear in Luke's writing more frequently than in any other part of the New Testament, are altogether women in thought and feeling and interest, in demeanor and ways of service, in loving faith unshaken by the Crucifixion, in that self-abnegation and all-absorbed devotion for which the only descriptive word is, womanly. The transcendent characterization is of her whose womanhood had been lost and was restored.

In this Lucan source must be included, because of the same characteristics of presentation, reports of Jesus' attitude to wealth. There are some passages which reflect the influence of the Jerusalem church in its unproductive communism, with which an indiscriminate antagonism to wealth and its possessors agrees. Mutually inconsistent statements are to be noted. The question of Jesus' conception of property involves more elements than belong to Luke's peculiar material, and extreme pronouncements of Luke's report must be estimated in the light of other data. True to Jesus is the warning and challenge against property as an end, and against an individualistic use of it, as in the tremendous drama of the man who fixed the great impassible gulf between himself and his suffering brother man.

Concerning what remains in Luke, outside the portions which have thus far been assigned to these sources:—the first two chapters, in which the simple beauty of folklore is blended with an accomplished literary imagination and artistry, are from additions to the tradition of Jesus' ministry rather than from developments of it. The skill in construction and diction does not extend to the simply stupid words ascribed to her who was to be the mother of Jesus, in her question to the angel. What else than motherhood could a betrothed Jewish maiden anticipate? With that impossible ineptness goes from Luke's authorship the angel's answer, proof-text for the virgin birth.

The stitches are plain which sewed this patch on, and its removal leaves the garment intact. It needs only the elimination, in the third chapter, of the obvious gloss, "as was supposed," which makes pointless the genealogy that follows, and in the second chapter the preference of the manuscript reading "wife" for "betrothed," to clear Luke from the teaching of the virgin birth. In this prologue whose exquisite poetry is a revelation of essentials of the Christian faith one historic value is of prime importance. Israel's intense hope of national deliverance is presented, especially in the psalmic outbursts of Mary, Zacharias and Simeon, as it existed among the Jewish people generally, and is distinguished both from revolutionary passion and apocalyptic dream.

There also appears in Luke a narrative source which he sometimes substitutes for Mark's narration. Partly by its aid he thinks himself able to write more "in order," "having traced all things accurately from the beginning,"—with the result of confusing the order of events still more. His use of this source,—or the source itself—is too fragmentary for us to estimate its value as contributing to an outline of Jesus' ministry. Details of it surely give us the real Jesus.

In Luke the appearances of the risen Lord are located in Jerusalem or near it. The more primitive tradition, clearly indicated in Mark, places at least the earlier appearances in Galilee. The account in the beginning of Acts so contradicts the ending of the gospel and is introduced so awkwardly and ungrammatically, that its ascription to this author is more than doubtful. The heavenly exaltation of Jesus was at the heart of the earliest Christian faith. But we find in the early tradition, exclusive of this evident interpolation near the beginning of Acts, no vision of his ascension. The words near the close of Luke's gospel, "and was taken up into heaven," lack sufficient manuscript evidence.

Matthew's additions to his two principal sources, Mark and Q, are limited by his use of Mark almost entire, and, in all probability, of Q beyond those passages which have Lucan parallels. Matthew has his own poem of the nativity, whose great beauty is dimmed by Luke's incomparable romance. We encounter a story of the virgin birth much more extended than that which intrudes into the other gospel. But it appears intrusive here. It destroys the purpose of the genealogy that traces Jesus from David, and which accords with the general early Christian belief. The explanation, that the genealogies in Matthew and Luke mean that Jesus was adopted into the Davidic family, does not satisfy the fervent conviction of Jesus' Davidic descent. We may either leave the incongruities unreconciled, and therefore meaningless, or read with one of the earliest manuscripts we have—though a Syrian, not a Greek manuscript—that Joseph was the father of Jesus. In that case it would be wellnigh impossible not to regard as an interpolation the last eight verses of the first chapter. Then the virgin birth of Jesus, when also excluded from Luke's gospel, would disappear entirely from the New Testament, leaving unobscured the sanctity of fundamental human relations and affections, whose consummation is the normal entrance of the Christ-child into humanity.

Other parts of Matthew beside those derived from Mark and from Q in the larger sense are so connected with this writer's purpose and method that they can be mentioned to better advantage under a characterization of this gospel in its entirety.

III

As we pass from the sources to the gospels which contain them we may first touch upon questions pertinent to them all. Each of these questions requires a treatise for

its adequate consideration. Only points of view can be presented here, and those very briefly indicated. The first question concerns the faithfulness of the compiling authors to their all-important sources. The general faithfulness of Matthew and Luke to Mark is evident. In their use of Q they are in essential agreement with one another, and therefore, as neither is dependent upon the other, with Q itself. Their treatment of these two sources implies a similar treatment of others. Not that they were mere copyists. A use of their own understanding even where it produced variances is not inconsistent with their use of their sources. We have not the same means of checking up Mark. But his book is redolent of the varied qualities of the sources which he evidently used. Certain discriminations of this general attitude of the synoptic evangelists to their sources can be made later, in characterizations of these evangelists severally.

Concerning the influence of the Hellenistic-Roman world upon sources and gospels;—while they had that world before them they had the Semitic world of Jesus back of them. Every increase in our knowledge of these two worlds, every insight into their differences, helps us to distinguish what is essentially our Lord's.

Our estimate of the Pauline influence upon sources and gospels must be viewed in the light of the fact which every study of Paul makes clearer; his necessary relation to the tradition of Jesus' ministry. Where his elaborations and departures affect our evangelists the distinguishing task is not too difficult.

Discussion of the dates of these gospels is not necessary for our purpose. For the important consideration is that they employed sources which connect us with the tradition as it existed within the lifetime of those whohad been companions of Jesus' ministry.

Two supplementary remarks, the second the much more

important:—Our current use of the term gospels does not agree with early Christianity's conception of them. Each was named "The gospel according to" the author to whom it was attributed. The meaning is that there is one gospel proclaimed by the several evangelists.

The evangel which was proclaimed was that Jesus is the Christ. Our studies of the aims of Jesus will show that this conception of his gospel is inadequate. His Messianic endowment was for that mission's accomplishment. In Jesus is consummately fulfilled the great word, "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted." Into the gospel which he declared he is exalted to be its realization and redemptive power.

IV

It remains to consider the distinctive qualities of each of the evangelists. The author of the gospel according to Mark may well have been the man to whom it was ascribed. The strong tradition is reinforced by the consideration that in the early church, with its emphasis upon apostolic authority, a gospel would not have been attributed to one who was not an apostle, except for reasons that seemed decisive.

Our gratitude for his indispensable service, which includes the Markan derivations in Matthew and Luke, requires, in order that we should avail ourselves of that service to the utmost, a recognition of his limitations, which affected the selection and treatment of his materials. One limitation is his hostility to the Jewish people and their religious leaders, and connected with that is an antagonism to the Jewish law. Here in particular is disclosed a Pauline influence, as also in his conception of Jesus' death. The heights and depths and intricacies of Paul's thought were beyond his comprehension. Therefore he exaggerated Paul's ideas, as when in the eleventh

and twelfth verses of the fourth chapter he made an overstraining of Paul's doctrine of election into the incredible announcement that Jesus taught in parables in order that his bewildered hearers might not be saved.

Mark's style is that of a man of the people. Though vivid and picturesque it is often crude, as some of his sources must have been. His Greek is inferior to that of the other New Testament books except the Apocalypse. His literary shortcomings were felt by Matthew and Luke, who in their parallels of Mark laboured to improve their original, sometimes, as in their accounts of Jesus in Gethsemane, with a loss of clearness and power.

The intellectual limitations of Mark are evident in his appetite for the marvellous. His spiritual deficiencies appear in his obsessive emphasis of Jesus as the Son of Man, to come in overwhelming power. To such a Christ are attributed unlimited miraculous powers in his earthly ministry. Yet in Mark's simplicity of mind we recognize the childlikeness which has preserved for us from the tradition Jesus' discovery of the significance of childhood. And Mark, man of the people, has for that reason made us feel with him the desperate condition of the racked bodies and agonized minds that sought Jesus' healing, and the divineness of our Lord's compassion. He whose abilities rose so little above the common Christian level of his contemporaries has shown us that the common Christian heart of his time and of all times can beat with the tremendous march of Jesus from the Northern mountains to his passion, and in the grace and power of Christ's death can deny itself and take up the cross and follow him.

No apostle wrote of Jesus in a compilatory method, and the gospel called by Matthew's name is not his. It is an attractive possibility that this ancient ascription confused the so-called gospel of Matthew with Q.

The characteristic interest of the unknown author is

evident in his arrangement of material. Sayings of Jesus are grouped in five principal divisions, connected by narratives which he was content to take largely from Mark's gospel, which he uses less discriminatively than does Luke. Jesus appeals to him as the consummate teacher. All nations are to be made his disciples, taught "to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you."

Where Matthew's reports of Jesus' words are evidently from Q, with Lucan parallels, their reliability is greatest. The other passages which have the quality of Q can also be attributed to that invaluable source. Not all his reports have that quality. In particular, attribution to Jesus, in two passages, of an anticipation of the church is not considered authentic by modern scholarship. And at the close of the twenty-fifth chapter the apocalyptic blazonry obscures the universal humanity, which we are accustomed to read into the passage from the heart of Jesus. This writer sometimes "spiritualizes" Jesus' teaching, as parallels in Luke show, where the latter is closer to the human, practical spirit of the Master.

The early popularity achieved by the gospel believed to be Matthew's exposed it to interpolations antedating our earliest manuscripts. The problem is not very important for our knowledge of Jesus. The passages of the synoptics generally which are open to this suspicion are not, whatever their authorship, accordant with Jesus' words and ways.

Matthew stands within the Jewish inheritance, which, as fulfilled by Christ, was to be imparted to the world. Jesus as the fulfilment of Israel's prophecies is a theme especially dear to him. The charge of legalism brought against Matthew has been overstrained. Rather, as we shall find, he is indispensable for the understanding of Jesus' aim and method.

The close of the gospel is so stupendously beautiful

that we may say, "Why should not he also receive visions and revelations of the Lord?" Intense Israelite, his universalism is for this very reason comparable to that of Luke, the cosmopolitan.

The identification of the author of the third gospel and Acts, one consecutive book, with Luke, the companion of Paul, is ably asserted by eminent scholars. Confirmatory of the argument is the consideration, already mentioned, that the early church, in its preference for apostolic authority, would not, without reasons that seemed to it decisive, have ascribed the gospel to one not an apostle.

Admiration for this man, whether Luke or another, as author of the world's greatest book, Gospel and Acts, is not diminished by our recognition of inevitable limitations. His attempt to write "in order" has not made the outline of Jesus' ministry clearer. Certain infrequent expressions of comparatively inferior quality may be perhaps traced to a connection with the church at Jerusalem after the transference of the apostles to the mission field. But no man has penetrated more deeply the heart of Jesus, and therefore the heart of mankind. He grasped the conception of Jesus as centre and soul of the world's life. Whether Gentile or Jew of the dispersion, he stood within the Hellenistic-Roman world, of which our world is the continuance, to receive into it that which alone could be its redemption. Luke is humanity accepting Christ.

CHAPTER VI

JESUS THE JEW

It was stated at the close of the first chapter that the insistent task of our time is to learn the aims of Jesus, so that all the elements and movements of our time may be directed to the accomplishment of his aims. To this endeavour belongs the critically reconstructive study of the tradition of Jesus' ministry.

It is sometimes convenient to speak of the aim of Jesus, sometimes of the aims of Jesus. This practice need not be confusing when it is recognized that what he purposed and worked for has unity in an inclusive aim and that this aim has concrete elements.

I

A distinction is evident between the aims of Jesus and the contents of his mind which were directed by them. So different from ours were his mental furnishings, the constituents of his life and thought, that a unity of aim in him and us might seem impossible for materials so diverse. Our science, a prominent example, with the mental habits which it enforces, was to him non-existent. Nor did he share our interest in the classic world of his time but not of his appropriation. The Hellenic philosophy whose disciples we are, even in our departures from it and down to our everyday thinking, the classic literature and art which flower in occidental civilization perennially, the political institutions, the social organizations, the origins of the scientific temper and its developments since the Hellenic-Roman period,—all these which are fatherland to us, were

remote from him. The substance of our life and thought is accordant in many respects with the dominant civilization of Jesus' day, from which he stood apart. Yet all the more for these differences can be felt the distinction between content and aims which can shape anything really human; and their universal humanness is the more deeply appreciated the more contrasted the material which his aims by their mighty working subdue unto themselves.

Another consideration which may encourage our search for the aims of Jesus is that they cannot be final, absolute in any repressive sense. Not only do they free the powers that are directed by them, not only do they unfold thought to learn them and quicken action to realize them, but as aims they are inexhaustible. They are not to be called ends, as fixed and final, but aims ever unfolding. Since aims constitute a personality, the reception of a man's aims is the reception of him. The great benefactors impart in them their inexhaustible powers, to be within us fountains of living water springing up into eternal life. It is a corollary of this faith, that when we receive the aims of a great soul any external authority of his upon us becomes impossible. Such words as example, imitation, are then pertinent only in symbolic, transcendent meanings. Any dictation or coercion is on a lower plane than the personal and social, the development of which our great and revered leaders desire for us.

The method which the reader is invited to follow for the discovery of the aims of Jesus is not that of elimination. That procedure refutes various views of the subject under consideration which are objectionable to the writer, until the reader, exhausted by a series of discussions that have not resulted in anything, is ready to take the writer's view without much further argument. A different method may prove to be less technical and uninteresting. I state at the outset that view of the inclusive aim of Jesus to

which I have been compelled, and then attempt to show that it works out a consistent conception of him and his career.

II

The aim of Jesus was the accomplishment of God's will in Israel. The phrase, the fulfilment of the divine ideal for Israel, does not differ in essential meaning but is less Hebraic and therefore less adequate.

This statement of Jesus' aim must, I fear, seem insufficient to some of those who think of him as working for the universal and eternal. How can we recognize the leader of the world and its ages, with a leadership supreme for all worlds and all their ages, in him whose aim was in Israel? Instead of the saviour of the realm which includes God's children everywhere, there walks along Judaean and Galilean hills the man who came to work for Israel. Against the Christ who reveals the universal Father to a religious consciousness which his mission created, and who is the founder of the religion absolute, the Christ from whose life and death and resurrection streams the cosmic light in which the sun and stars grow pale, there stands in a narrow place one whose words and deeds are of and in and for a little segment of mankind. We have shrunk from ascribing to him human limitations, and here is the man who was altogether the Jew.

And yet the revelations of the divine, the infinite, the eternal, are received from the definite tasks of those who are faithful to just what their work in their place has to do. More than to the philosophies which have attempted the construction of a spiritual universe do we owe our experience of the spiritual and universal to those who saw some definite good to work for and toiled in concentration for just that. The supreme influence of exceptional minds is in their definite tasks, like Fichte giving himself to arouse

to a new life the spirit of Germany that seemed crushed beneath the disasters of the Napoleonic wars, or whenever a master of wisdom and power shapes a crisis of human affairs to the outcome clearly envisaged by his thought and devotion. In the imperative definiteness the universal is enfolded, and emerges from it because implicit in it. Jesus gave himself to the one purpose laid upon him, and in that purpose are the aims of every soul and of humanity and of God.

Upon his aim and task Jesus concentrated every energy. The distinction is familiar between men to whom thought is the chief interest and those whose dominant impulse, natural or acquired, is to do. Vast, crude multitudes belong to the latter class, and also those whom humanity pronounces great, in thankful recognition of toils for its sake. In such men inward process and experience are concentrated upon the work to be done in the aim to be accomplished. All thoughts from Jesus are stimulus to our action because they were such stimulus to him. They deepen and calm us by removing the inward distractions and hindrances to effort. They collect and unify our serviceable powers. When our action is thwarted by material destructions, resistances from other men, pain and physical weakness, losses, griefs, bereavements, even by exhaustions and the approach of death, we are inspired to higher achievements by Christ who energizes us in our infirmities, who won increase of power from antagonisms, and whose consummate accomplishment was wrought in his death agony. In him life's refreshments also were for its strifes. Our delights in beauty, exquisite solacings of love, heights of contemplation, mystical sublimities, are accumulations of forces to work with; even as he derived strength from wayside flowers, from the austerities of mountains, from observation of the ways of God in rain and sunshine, in beast and bird and little child; and we

kneel at the threshold of his sanctuaries of all-night prayer, to arise and follow him into toils flooded with the divine forces which he received into his invincible soul. Will and power, concentration upon his life's aim, we find in Jesus, supreme among men of action.

That Jesus' aim was the accomplishment of God's will in Israel, or in more modern phrase, the fulfilment of the divine ideal for Israel, is shown most significantly by his Israelitish inheritance. Its depth and penetration in him were complete. As far as we can look into the mind and heart of Jesus we find him Israelitish altogether. No other aim than his accomplishment of God's will in Israel accords with this spiritual consciousness, which was unqualified devotion. This devoted spiritual consciousness and the aim to accomplish God's will in Israel were more than indissoluble. They were identical.

Representations in the gospels of a cosmopolitanism that does not belong to Jesus (his real universalism will be estimated later) are explained by the history of the tradition and its synoptic compilation, whose outlines have been sketched in the preceding chapter. We have seen that it is a history into which entered influences that hardened and narrowed the portrayal of the mind of Jesus, and also influences from the extension of the gospel into the Gentile world. The suspicion may occur, whether the narrowing tendencies may not have distorted a cosmopolitan Jesus into a Jewish Jesus. But such a supposition, however attractive at the first suggestion, has no historic basis. The evident limitations and misapprehensions which appear in the tradition concern his aim to accomplish God's will in Israel. They do not indicate a different aim.

Mark's antagonism to his own people, reproduced in Matthew and Luke, should not be extended into our estimate of Jesus. Nor is that evangelist's hostile spirit identi-

cal with his Master's appeal and terrific warning to his own countrymen. Mark's reactions to the extensions and modifications of the gospel in the Gentile world and his crude conceptions of Pauline principles are not attributable to Jesus. It is a wild leap from our Lord's assertion that personal defilement is from within and not from without, to Mark's inference which abrogates at a stroke a considerable section of the Jewish law. If we ascribe to Jesus the parable of the wicked husbandmen and infer some parable of similar purport from the impossible tale of the cursing of the fig tree, such warnings are in the line of Jesus' purpose, continued to the end, to save his people.

Mark's fragmentary accounts of Jesus' activities beyond the Holy Land do not warrant the assumption of a Gentile ministry; except as his compassion overflowed to every human need. The purpose of these excursions does not appear to be an extension of his work. And if, according to passages whose exaggerations are evident, many came to him into Galilee from predominantly heathen lands, we are not told whether an appreciable number of Gentiles were included. It is a romantic fancy, not an historic judgment, which reads Jesus' conversion from Judaism to cosmopolitanism into the story of the Syro-Phoenician woman. Its exaggeration of the marvellous, its evident omissions and crudities, make it an incident possible to Jesus only when allowance is made for them.

In Matthew's gospel we find an exaltation of Jesus above the revelation of the Old Testament. This attribution is connected with Matthew's conception of Jesus as supreme teacher, with authority to retain or eliminate what he will. The words, "It was said to them of old time, but I say unto you," would have appeared to Jesus to contain a spiritual self-contradiction, an irreligious presumption, equivalent to the assertion: God said that

word once, I say its contrary now. The formal scheme in which Matthew's Sermon on the Mount arranges the utterances by which the will of God is brought into the inner life is evidently a compiler's scheme. The authority with which Jesus spoke for God included a penetrative insight into earlier revelations, not their abrogation. His mission said: "Think not that I came to destroy the law and the prophets! I came not to destroy, but to fulfill." The single apparent exception which is accordant with the thought of Jesus is his fundamental revision of the Mosaic law of divorce; and this is a confirmation of his Israelitish faithfulness. The Mosaic ordinance was to him such an adaptation to hardness of heart as may be necessary in a formal legislation, while God's real design, absolute upon every man, is given in a supposedly more ancient expression of his will. The above emendations of the synoptic representations are not exhaustive, but representative.

Significant is Jesus' opposition to those contemporary groups and tendencies in which the Israelitish consciousness was modified, sometimes destroyed, by interests external to it. The reference is not to those influences which had been blended into Judaism, as the faith in the life hereafter, but to those which continued to be outside. Not to attempt the difficult interpretation of the Essenes, and related movements still more obscure, whose influence upon Jesus, if appreciable, was confirmatory of his devotion to his ancestral faith,—there were the Sadducees, with their unspirituality, and their addiction to anti-Jewish political interests, which exposed them to the motives and manners of Gentile life. Other extensive groups, of various degrees and shades of degeneracy, consisted of "sinners," who had yielded to temptations to cut themselves off from Israel's law and promises. Not a group but a residuum were those who just drifted and sank into

sensuality, lawlessness and irreligious insensibility. The various groups extended their influence among those who were not strictly identified with them. Of infamous distinction were the hangers-on of Herodian courts, among them some of "the chief estates of Galilee," the patrons of amphitheatres, the dilettantes of the intrusive Hellenic art and culture, the admirers and frequenters of pagan temples. There were heathen cities in the Holy Land, which were populated in part by Jewish renegades. There were also influences from Jews of the dispersion, in addition to those elements which Judaism had incorporated. Of an effect upon Jesus of any of these groups, movements, tendencies, there is no trace. They make clear to us what he was not. He felt no need of a Gamaliel's receptiveness to what was outside of Judaism. His own humanism had meat to eat that Paul's teacher knew not of.

Jesus' separateness from these modifications, degeneracies, and intrusions was not due to ignorance of them. They were all about him from his infancy. It was not due to a rustic's insensibility: his parables especially disclose the opposite of the stolid peasant mind. All the varied life about him was penetrated by his clear vision. He knew the motives and interests of Gentile life. His elimination of Gentile influence was his unqualified decision for that which is purely of Israel. He was the Jew from conscious choice. This enhances the significance of his complete Judaism.

It is not enough to call Jesus a Jew. Jesus was the Jew. He is the universal Saviour because of the intensity of his Jewish consciousness.* For humanity's religious genius has its depth and height and length and breadth not in our Hellenic-Roman civilization, which is world-appropriating, nor in any of that quality, nor in the consciousness

* The theses of this paragraph are developed in the author's *Christian Reconstruction of Modern Life.*

which is world-effacing, but in the Semitic faith which because world-transcending subdues the world to itself. Its universal expression is the religion of Israel, consummated in the spirituality of Jesus, that it may be the guidance of our civilization and every other.

Jesus' aim was that of every great Israelitish prophet and prophetically minded lawgiver that had preceded him; but in him there was a far deeper consciousness of the essential and its implications. It is necessary to affirm against the degenerate Judaism which invaded the tradition and against modern disparagements of him, that his aim and teaching was not more limited than that of the prophets. The Israel for which he also toiled and suffered was for them and for him the Israel of a perfected social order, in which the divine will was to be so accomplished that Israel might become the leader of all nations.

III

Before we consider these two essentials of the divine aim for Israel, which are its intensity in Israel and its extension by Israel, it is well to attend to Jesus' use of the source from which especially he learned them. This is the Old Testament, or more accurately, the selection which Jesus made intuitively from it. We are brought to another source of information concerning him, no less important than the sources of the synoptics. Discriminations here are just as necessary, for he made them.

The question of the extent of Jesus' knowledge of the Old Testament is not significant. Its essentials he knew. God's ways as he profoundly traced them there he followed to the cross and beyond. Here is no disparagement of his originality. What originality is valuable except that which penetrates, assimilates, deepens, unfolds, energizes that which has been acquired? This is the most truly

creative originality, for that which has thus been received discloses to the recipient its implicit creative powers.

Much of the Old Testament did not exist for him. The deity of storm and battle, in whose name were committed massacres of civilized cities by brigands of the wilderness, was more remote from him than from us, as the recent history of our alleged Christendom testifies. The immoralities and insensibilities which are extensive desert tracts of the Old Testament were as alien to him as animism and fetichism, which indeed infected them. His higher criticism was by intuitive selection.

The difference is patent between Jesus' use of the Old Testament and the early church's manipulations of it. To his disciples after his death it was an arsenal of proof-texts to establish the thesis that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ. The wildest modern interpreters of the Apocalypse are less ingenious than the early preachers of the gospel. Matthew and Paul and the epistle to the Hebrews furnish samples of the extravagant exegesis of the early missionaries and of those who under their direction "searched the scriptures to see whether these things are so." We have seen how this obsession affected the tradition of Jesus' ministry, as in Mark's story of the Crucifixion, constructed principally from verses of the Old Testament. The conviction grew that all its sacred words somehow referred to Jesus, so that at length no detail of ritual was too mechanical, no atrocity too abhorrent, no indelicacy too coarse to be a prefiguring of him.

The early disciples included in their argument the ancient prophetic longings for the coming of Israel's true king, the Christ. These are illuminations of Jesus. They affected profoundly his consciousness and mission. The universal desire, most nobly expressed in Israel's prophets, for the deliverer of oppressed humanity, for the healer of mankind which is sick in body and mind, the prayer of

the ages for the advent of the divine kingdom of righteousness and peace under the royal soul who knows God's purpose and the forces of its accomplishment among men, these longings are indeed fulfilled in Jesus. But the early church was encumbered with the forms in which these prophecies had been constructed by ancient conceptions of kingship, except as the Christian eschatology transcendentally materialized these forms still further from their essential ethical and spiritual significance. We find in the tradition indications of Jesus' deeper penetration, luminous with the ancient prophetic consciousness, and accordant with the great prophetic aims.

IV

From the prophetic parts of the Old Testament as sources of our knowledge of Jesus we learn, with the corroboration of the other sources, his social passion and construct his social gospel. If there were not in the sources from the tradition of his ministry indications of the social aim of Jesus, we should not be justified in imputing it to him merely because it pervades ancient sacred writings. On the other hand the comparative indistinctness of such testimonies in our gospels should not conceal from us his social significance. The forces that obscured his social teachings and endeavours have been already referred to, and will be discussed more fully in a later chapter. When we turn upon Jesus the light of the ancient prophets and lawgivers whom he followed and consummated, his career becomes to us a social ministry directed by social aims.

There is no need to enlarge upon the tremendous social passion of the great prophets of Israel. Prophecy has come to mean to us not the clairvoyant foretelling of events, but the declaration of God's will as social righteous-

ness against the injustices and insensibilities of their time and of every time. The predictive element of that true prophecy means the confidence that God's will is to be accomplished in judgment and redemption. There was insight into the forces which achieve the divine purpose, with the unwavering faith that apparently irretrievable disasters are for its accomplishment.

The prophets were not content with partial social ameliorations. They demanded the complete reconstruction of the social order, a people in which every relation of men to one another, all the works men do together, must be the accomplishment of the divine will of justice, mercy and love. The conception was expressed in the sublime word, Torah, for which there is no equivalent in any classic or modern language. In that word prophecy and law are interblended in the one indissoluble ideal, the accomplishment of the divine will in all human life, in all the relations of men to one another. In accordance with this conception great prophetic movements issued in social reorganizations. The outcome of the prophetic work represented by such reformers as Amos, Isaiah and Micah was the Deuteronomic legislation. Most of the other legislation of the Pentateuch was formed by the prophetic inspirations which rose from the fall of the Jewish state and the calamities of the Babylonian captivity. Every such movement is liable to degeneration into meticulous legalism, which chokes its original inspiration. The critical study of the Old Testament has been too much occupied with this decline, to the neglect of the prophetic consciousness, as represented in the legislation itself, and in the Psalms and other of the later books of the Old Testament, in the best of still later Jewish literature, in the life of the Jewish people in Jesus' day, and pre-eminently in Jesus himself, in whom the sublime purpose and passion of the Torah, as prophecy and law, were fulfilled.

These assertions concerning Jesus anticipate the chapters that follow, in their attempt to disclose the social aims of Jesus. Yet they and what follows in this chapter are not out of place here. His intimate relation to the Old Testament, his Israelitish consciousness, whose intensity will appear more clearly as our study goes on, warrant us in interpreting his declaration of the kingdom of God as social gospel, and Jesus as the supreme antagonist of social wrongs, the leader of the onward march of humanity to the perfecting of every relation of man to man in every work that men have to do together, in every value which is consummated for any man only as it is achieved in the mutual service of the common, the universal life.

This aim of Jesus is implicit in his compassions, which were not only for lost souls but also for diseased bodies and minds, which he set free to be instruments of soul and for service in God's kingdom. His practical compassion was not only for spiritual need but also for that poverty which robs men of joys and worths, crushes spiritual powers and incapacitates for social ministries. The contrast between the Beatitudes of Luke's sermon on the plain, spoken to a multitude, and those of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, spoken to a select few (where the reference at the close to the listening multitude betrays that the exclusiveness of the introduction is the evangelist's invention) opens wide to us a door left ajar in the tradition. If it is necessary to correct Matthew's "spiritualized" Beatitudes by Luke's humane Beatitudes, so must the tradition generally be scrutinized. What response to men's basilar needs is more complete than Christ's healing ministry! It is impossible to think of that ministry as a mere credential, or as incidental, or as less than expressive of Jesus' passion and aim. But it may be objected, the aims of Jesus were spiritual aims!—Into the warp and woof of

common human life must these aims be wrought, and—to anticipate again later chapters—only the aims of Jesus are sufficient to include and complete every element of life.

V

In the second place: Jesus' relation to the Old Testament makes it impossible that the universalism of the great prophets of Israel should not have possessed him who was Israelite indeed. Against the hate cherished by many in Judaism to the nations that know not God and his holy law, shines in magnificent passages of the Jewish literature of Jesus' time the consciousness of God's universal purpose of redemption through Israel. Whether he knew any of those writings or not, he was not insensible to that which they expressed, and which was deep in the heart of his people, and taught by great ancient prophets of Israel. But what was the universalism of the heights of Israel's prophecy? It was not directed away from Israel but unto Israel. Israel's conquest of the nations and civilizations is to be the centralizing of the world in Israel. When Israel goes out to the peoples it is to draw them to itself. "The nations shall come to thy light." The universal attainment of peace and prosperity, of righteousness and brotherhood in the perfected social order dawns when "the mountain of Jahveh's house is established on the summits of the mountains, and is exalted above the heights, and all nations shall flow unto it; and the peoples say one to another, 'Come and let us go up to the mountain of Jahveh, even to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths.'" It is spiritual centralization. There is no political domination by Israel. But throughout the world engines of strife are turned into productive instruments of civilization, and every conflict of nations and within nations, of class

against class, of man against man not only ceases, but is annihilated, forgotten, when "out of Zion goes forth Torah and the word of Jahveh from Jerusalem." In this aim the will of God must be accomplished in Israel. This was the universalism of the great prophets. This was the universalism, though it became obscured, of the greatest of them. The purpose of Jesus, of which our knowledge is not dependent upon the authenticity of any passage, not even of any that meets every test, is that men shall come from the East and from the West to Israel's feast of the kingdom of God.

Why obscured, it is not hard to see. Two forces worked for a result far beneath the aim of Jesus. One was the narrow particularism represented in the decadent successor of the Jerusalem church, and the other was an evangelizing current, not of the apostles, which carried abroad a gospel whose noblest elements were neglected. There were those who were infected by a mechanical Judaism antithetic to the Judaism of Jesus. There were those who felt the universalism of Jesus, without comprehending that he was the Christ of Israel, and by that title the saviour of the world which he would centre in the Israel of God's accomplished purpose. That which prevailed was not the victory of his aim.

VI

Before considering the nature and content of that fidelity of Jesus, let us look at the practical wisdom of his way of accomplishing God's will in Israel, that in this accomplishment the world might find its salvation. His wisdom was tragically vindicated by that terrific catastrophe of early Christianity whose lamentable effects have been evident in all subsequent Christian and Jewish history, the Jews' loss of Christianity, and Christianity's loss of the Jews.

After the disastrous rebellion of Bar Cochbar, a little over a century from Jesus' ministry, and the result of which was the intensest concentration of Pharisaic Judaism, the winning of the Jews to Christianity was evidently a lost cause. But the cause had been long lost. Paths widely separated issued then in different worlds. Lingering remnants of Jewish Christianity declined into insignificant, disintegrating sects. Paul's magnificent hope proved baseless. Paulinism's triumph song, the epistle to the Ephesians, of the power of Christ to break down the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, was not heard beyond that impenetrable division.

The sublimity of Paul's genius, his Christlike devotion to Christ, the value of his contribution to the development of truths and powers implicit in Jesus' gospel, the vastness of his achievement which has shaped world history, and his intense though ineffective endeavour to unite Jew and Gentile, should not conceal from us the results of an aim which was not identical with the aim of Jesus. And when we recognize the great historic forces which impelled the apostle of the Gentiles, we are turned to him in whom humanity can master forces which without him are irresistible. Two currently accepted judgments of the people and events concerned need a closer scrutiny. One is the alleged obduracy of the Jewish race. The second is the assumed relative unimportance of another endeavour to save the world by Christ's gospel.

The Jewish race, then as now scattered among the nations, rejected Christ. What was the Christ whom they so rejected that his Jewish disciples turned back and walked with him no more? It was not the Christ who was the consummation of Israel's religion. It was not he whose life declared: "Think not that I came to destroy the law and the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil."

Christianity among the Jewish people slackened its

advance, stopped, wavered, disappeared, not only in the Holy Land, where the process might conceivably be assigned to antagonistic local forces, but also throughout the Jews of the empire and beyond. It is a too superficial and prejudiced explanation, that the failure of Christianity to win and retain them was because they were less receptive than the Gentiles, with a history that exposes them as always "stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears." That history which like all history is full of the resistances that always oppose the good, was yet the noblest reception of moral and spiritual ideals that the world had ever achieved. Their repudiation of Christianity was not because the glory of Jesus' life and death made a slighter appeal to their "hardened and impenitent heart." To cite one receptiveness among many: the sources of our synoptic gospels are Jewish sources, and at least two of these three gospels are of Jewish authorship, and the New Testament was mainly if not entirely written by Jews. The earliest Christian history is replete with devotions of Jewish disciples. It is not true that the Jewish people or their religious leaders delivered Jesus to the cross. Nor was the final refusal due to an obsession of external legalism against his filial obedience of the heart. That deeper consciousness was not unshared by representative doctors of their law; and in the Holy Land and beyond, many hearts were responsive to Jesus' fulfilment of the law and the prophets.

The loyalty of the Jewish race to its law, in Palestine and throughout the Roman empire and beyond, was decisive against that Christianity which claimed emancipation from the law, and which, beginning to be accepted by the Gentiles, turned to the Jews demanding (for this was the implicit demand) that they merge themselves into it. What the issue meant to the Jew we cannot learn from the records of the law's meticulous perversions. Nor

can we learn that significance from the Pauline polemic which treats of the law from the viewpoint of individual justification. There is left out of his consideration its appeal as social power, extending over all human life and relations, determining them all in accordance with the divine will. When Christianity repudiated that which the religious social genius of the Jew regarded as indispensable, as the divine regulation of all life and all the relations of men to one another, then the Jew "turned back and walked with him no more."

It was indeed true that in contemporary Judaism this great social meaning was obscured by a multitude of restrictive observances which were contrary to its nature and aim. But one came who grasped the significance, therefore liberated it and implicitly universalized it. He achieved in perfection that which noble souls of the Jewish race had so far comprehended as to prepare for his personal social gospel of faith and obedience, of love and law.

Of the other great missionary endeavour little information has come to us, to our great loss. Unlike the Pauline mission it has given us no historian. The incomplete descriptions of it in the first part of the book of Acts are through one who regarded it as a preliminary to the Pauline mission. He has few illuminating references to it after he begins to narrate the work of his hero, from whose point of view he regards it, as far as his conciliatory desire to present all the missionary movements as harmonious permitted him to refer to it. We gather the most valuable part of our knowledge of it from its reflections in the gospels, but there the course of its history is lacking. The attempt of the school of Baur to reconstruct it has been judged incorrect, though this correct judgment may have too little regard for the valuable elements of that attempt. Most of Paul's allusions are to narrow perversions of Judaism.

The direct destination of this mission was to Jews throughout the world. To Peter, as its leader, so Paul writes, was committed "the gospel of the circumcision." The work included the presentation of Christ to Gentiles with Jews. For many Jewish congregations had Gentile adherents. Peter's administration is largely lost to us. It is questionable whether Paul or the author of Acts understood him. We have no writings of his. He is not guilty of Second Peter. The noble epistle which bears his name is, with other difficulties, too dependent upon Pauline conceptions to be ascribed to him.

No man can tell what might have been. Yet a reasonable appreciation of Jesus warrants the supposition, that if his aim and method of accomplishing God's will in Israel in order that through Israel the world might be saved, had been carried through a world evangelization, the result would have been the deepening of Israel's law, in accordance with his apprehension of it, into an incomparably closer ordering of human life by God's will than appears in our alleged Christendom. From that which is called Christendom we turn, for the real Christendom's realization, to his aim. It is beyond the scope of our subject to trace the degeneration of Christianity into another prescriptive legalism which was not accordant with the aims of Jesus.

What that divine will was to Jesus in his aim to accomplish it in Israel and through Israel, will be considered further in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VII

JESUS AND ISRAEL'S LAW

I

Jesus the Jew was devoted to Israel's law. For Israel is the people of the law; law filled with the spirit of the great prophets, Torah. His aim, to accomplish the will of God in Israel, was to bring Israel to the fulfilment of its law.

This historic conception of Jesus encounters strong oppositions and intense prejudices. It is thought that it isolates him from humanity's religious progress, deprives him of permanent spiritual leadership, separates him from the higher forms of religious consciousness and from Christianity itself, which must then look to Paul, not to Jesus, as its founder. In the vindication of Jesus' consciousness and purpose belongs the clarification of his relation to Israel's law. For the understanding of the relation certain misconceptions of that law must be corrected.

One of these misconceptions is due to Paul. To law he opposes grace, to justification by the works of the law justification by faith. In these contrasts his thought proceeds, not indeed without confusions of other conceptions and different significancies of law, from the law of Israel, done away, he thinks, by Christ, and leading to Christ by its own insufficiency to justify and save. Magnificent is his conception of the sufficient moral power of faith's life of the spirit. But he does not see that life of the spirit in the law of Israel.

Thus from Paul there has been received such a concep-

tion of Israel in its devotion to the law as obscures important elements of that devotion. Among these is an intense faith in the divine fatherhood, with free forgiveness of sins, a forgiveness that redeems, restores. Of Israel's joy in God's law, delight in the commandments, he gives hardly an intimation. Nor did he comprehend its social significance, as the organization of all human life unto the purpose of the absolutely gracious, loving will of the Father. There is indeed a Jewish legalism which merits Paul's condemnation and from which it is necessary to set men free. This Jesus did by disclosing the law's inmost spirit and universal principle.

Another source of misconception has been corrected by the scholarship which was partly to blame for it, but the misconception lingers. The critically reconstructive study of the Old Testament has transferred to a later historic development legal codes formerly attributed to the nation's origin. Not Moses but Ezra is their representative. Thus we have been taught that the age of prophecy declined into the age of legalism. We have been shown in the place of the inspired prophet the priest and the scribe; instead of universalism an exclusive nationalism, and the freedom of the spirit exchanged for the bondage of the letter.

This is not the whole truth. In this phase of Israel's life, in Old Testament writings that describe it, there is indeed prescription and externalism, which required that a great teacher, none less than the Christ himself, should set men free from restrictive legalism by liberating the law's inmost power. This was possible because of the spirituality at the heart of Israel's life under or rather in the law.

The Old Testament scholarship which has located in Israel's history its elaborated written law, not as a sudden intrusion but a development of innate forces which had

expressed themselves in the Deuteronomic legislation of Josiah's day and earlier, has also placed in the Judaism which is dated from Ezra other writings which express deep spirituality. To this Judaism belong many of the Psalms, also prophetic books, and prophetic passages misplaced in the older prophets, and much in the books of wisdom, which range from maxims of worldly prudence to the incomparable climax of the drama of Job, where humanity at its highest achievement through purificatory sufferings attains the vision of God before whom it abhors itself and repents in dust and ashes. The lyric reflection of the noblest psalms is sufficient for life's darkest mysteries, rises above the most poignant miseries, by finding God the soul's absolute sufficiency, and life in his love and care the supreme blessedness. Post-exilic psalms are suffused with that spiritual joy in the law which belongs only to the soul that has freedom there. Nor is there in such writings any intimation of rivalry or variance between entire obligation to the law and deepest, tenderest filial trust and love to its divine author. In Jesus' day this consciousness was preserved, as is evident in contemporary testimonies of Jewish literature and prayers of the synagogue and home. The spirit of joyous devotion to the divine law was in the meek and lowly of heart, and was perfected in him whose every thought and action was a son's delight to know and do the Father's will.

This filial consciousness of Judaism in its devotion to the law has been obscured by an over-emphasis upon Jewish apocalyptic writings as representative of the religious thought and feeling of Jesus' contemporaries. There is indeed little place in apocalyptic vision for filial communion with the All-terrible. Their tendency is to represent God as remote in his mysterious purpose and reserved power. Visible objects are imagined for the melodrama of world destruction and final judgment.

The murky air is filled with angelic presences which intervene between God and the soul. That the prevalence of such apocalyptic conceptions has been exaggerated will be shown in the next chapter.

Unfamiliar to the characteristic Jewish piety were mediating hypostases between God and man. To know the Jewish consciousness of God in Jesus' time we do not go to Philo, but to such expressions as have been already indicated. When Jesus spoke of the Father he uttered a familiar faith. The people of the law prayed to the Father.

An extensive rabbinic literature acquaints us with Israel's religious consciousness in Jesus' day. These writings, in which the Mishna is the name best known, date from the beginning of the third century after Christ. But the interval does not affect essentially their value as representing correctly the Jewish spirit of the time of Jesus. The endeavour was to conserve the religious tradition of former teachers recognized as authoritative, a tradition which had been kept in memories marvellously trained by the system of rabbinic instruction. Additions to that system after Jesus' time were applications of the law to new conditions and were made in consistency with that tradition.

A description of the work of the men to whom we owe this literature and that which has followed it through the centuries of Judaism, would lead us far afield. Its purpose was to apply Israel's law to all the personal and social life of Israel. What these writings contain of unsystematized theological reflection and eschatological expectation is viewed in its light. To say that multitudes of their injunctions are meticulous, mechanical, prescriptive, is true, but not true to the consciousness of those who in love to the law would regulate by it the details of worship, personal conduct and social relations, yet recognizing realms of the spirit into which prescription does not in-

trude. The law is conceived as essentially inward and spiritual, as the trustful, joyous, holy, heroic life directed to the accomplishment of God's will. Such was their intent. It is too much to claim that they solved the problem of harmonizing law prescriptive with law spiritual.

Conservative was their work, but with a certain selective conservatism. Between them and the ministry of Jesus Judaism had passed through purifying fires. Their hard conditions and intense endeavour aroused spiritual perceptions beyond those which we can attribute widely to the religious leadership in the days of Jesus' ministry. Yet from them we learn the main currents of Judaism's religious life. Other movements, some of which have left written memorials, are not to be compared with this as revealing the forces which he had to work with or against, and the conditions of his task of accomplishing the will of God in and through Israel.

In every age of Judaism the law by which Israel lived could be derived only partially from the Old Testament. "The tradition of the elders" was also necessary for the ordering of all the personal and social life of Israel, which could not be covered by written codes. Familiar customs and traditions were presupposed, and amplifications also were necessary. The law must be continually enlarged for continually changing conditions. This process requires the direction of the expert, who in Judaism was the scribe, "bringing forth from his treasures things new and old." Since law is to Israel the divine will his office is a religious function. Since the law extends to the details of every man's life and social relations it must be taught to the people, its meaning expounded, its applications defined. He instructs in the religious meetings of the synagogue, Judaism's marvellous instrument of life in the law. He must know the Old Testament. He must know the tradition as the succession of scribes had formed it. He

must be skilled to apply and extend the law to new situations. Co-ordinated labours are necessary. The united work of the scribes involved scribal debate, that the life of Israel might be the harmonious observance of the divine will. The issue of the debates was of equal validity with the written law, although or rather because subordinated to it. Debates might be long continued. "Schools" of interpretation rose inevitably. Their divergencies should not be exaggerated. Every agreement was the basis for the consideration of new problems as they arose. All these inevitable procedures might lay upon life an increasingly heavy yoke and burden: they might be a vitalizing process. The spirit of the law might be lost in a multiplicity of prescriptions; or there might be a continual simplification, clarification and spiritual advance in the accomplishment of God's will in Israel. In this spirit the question was asked, "Which is the chief commandment," —the inclusive principle from which every observance is derived?

II

Thus there was presented to Jesus the universal problem of law prescriptive or liberative, either repressing human life or leading humanity to ever greater beauty, harmony and power. The shallow soul tries to escape from law, like the most futile misleaders of the present hour. The deeper soul seeks its own completeness in law's inmost principle. The problem that confronted Jesus he recognized as the inclusive human problem, as it presented itself to him in Israel's law. His solution was definite, therefore concretely universal. It was an historic solution, for the accomplishment of God's will in Israel, therefore of universal historic import. He needed no considerations external to Israel's law. Its inmost significance is that of law universal.

The closest conflicts are not between opposing principles, as spirituality and materialism, despotism and democracy, but between opposing aspects of the same principle. They may be the bitterest conflicts, but not necessarily so. There may be felt beneath all the animosities the vital unity. Jesus' deadly conflict was not with Pharisaism. He and the Pharisees, "strictest sect of our religion" were one in devotion to Israel's law. So far as the Pharisees conceived it as prescriptive, external, repressive, Jesus and they were in closest conflict.

As far as law is not perfect freedom it is abject slavery. That which is imposed upon me, either by compulsion or by promise and threat, which are even more coercive and repressive, enslaves, whether I am rewarded here or hereafter because I obey it, or am plunged into present misery or future hell because I do not obey. Religion sinks into what is inadequately called legalism, a term misleading because it fails to distinguish law in the lower sense and law in the higher sense and therefore confuses religion at its height with religion in a base form. The term in the lower meaning connotes a religion hostile to human progress, destructive of life's values. For however salutary in themselves may be any or all of its prescriptions, even though they correspond in appearance with that which the enfranchised soul wills to do in the will of God, each one of them is a link in the chain that permits to no human faculty a movement except from the hand that holds the chain. Thus religion has become man's irreconcilable adversary, and men turn to atheism for humanity's powers and values. But that man has entered the perfect freedom to whom God's will is his own will, God's law his own inmost being. Happy are the children—alas so few!—to whom the law of the household is continuously interpreted as the attainment of their freedom. Blessed is the mother who knows the significance of the law of

motherhood, so that each of her children may find every instruction in God's law a delight because an advance into larger realizations of the soul. There is no conflict between law and love. He loved most who prayed at the ultimate test that the Father's will might be done. There is no conflict between law and faith, since there is none between faith and love.

Reverence for Judaism grows with every unbiased study of it. Such a study clears the representatives of Judaism in Jesus' day not indeed from his incisive criticism, but from the indiscriminate accusations which, beginning in the early history of Christianity, and affecting the tradition of Jesus' ministry and our gospels, have had their part in bitterest animosities and crimes beyond all horror. Candid and sympathetic appreciation is not diminished but clarified when we distinguish spiritual Judaism from Judaism's prescriptive elements. Much of this latter is less a perversion than an incompleteness. Jesus had no need to seek a spiritual consciousness beyond Judaism. His task was fulfilment.

Prescriptive legalism begins with details of conduct, in the vain endeavour to make external rules for all possible contingencies, to anticipate every case, not distinguishing between means and ends of action, and to eliminate everything which is not according to rule. The attempt involves unlimited control by an infallible tradition, to which must be added new exactions upon irrepressibly emergent human developments and relations. To make its task less preposterously difficult it opposes these developments, restricts these relations. It would keep men where they are or turn them back into narrower fields. The task of prescriptive legalism requires an enormous erudition, fixed in memory, so remaining the exclusive possession of a dominant class. Such knowledge and invention cannot be essayed except by those who are fitted

for it by mnemonic retentiveness and casuistic ingenuity. If higher qualities are present they may become overshadowed or atrophied. The learned lay upon the vulgar the iron grip of elaborate rules. Since life can be enclosed in no formulas there issue insoluble contradictions. The more strained the grip the more does conscience squirm out of it. The censorious judgment, "This people that knoweth not the law is accursed," falls heaviest upon the simple who forget and misunderstand. The required obedience becomes for poor people who have to earn their bread as they can, economically impossible. And what is worse, a religious distinction is drawn between godly well-to-do and ungodly poor.

As the letter waxes the spirit wanes. As rules advance principles retire. Men make their obedience selective, sparing favorite propensities. The correct outside may cover a hell within, while external propriety courts the praise of men. The lust of praise fosters censoriousness, hard, implacable, inhuman. With censoriousness grows hypocrisy, especially that destructive hypocrisy which deceives one's own soul. Or because the breach of one commandment is violation of the whole law men give up the task altogether and are numbered with the ungodly. The soul that might find in its own inner room the Father's forgiveness and restoration sees no mercy-seat among external precepts. Thus the law is annulled every way. It has ceased to be the will of God in the soul of man.

But are we contemplating the underside of ancient Pharisaism, or the unloveliest aspect of a New England village? The *unco guid* are of the same stripe everywhere and the effect of them is always the same. As long as men pervert excellence into its opposite, changing the search for truth into dogmatism, faith into lethargy, affection into sentimentality, so long, in men's conceptions, will the law that guides stars and electrons be perverted into

materialism, "the moral law within" into formalism, the supreme righteousness into the absolute unfatherliness.

III

The great man finds his task, though it be the task supreme, universal, eternal, to be always the task next his hand. He accepts the given situation, uses the available instruments, concentrates himself upon the definite concrete, yet never losing in the details of the particular the immanence of the universal.

Jesus' method was conservative. It conserved familiar forms because it recognized their spiritual meaning. The recognition of such spiritual meaning in them creates deeper and finer conceptions, in accordance with which the less adequate expressions become transformed. The inferior leader would smash the forms, failing to estimate their expressiveness, so destroying in man's hearts their familiar power. Yet the superior leader has an intenser iconoclasm. He is determined to destroy every intrusion which obscures the significance of the expression. Therefore Jesus' spiritual indignation purified the temple that it might be preserved for Israel and the world as God's house of prayer.

Jesus' method was national. Those whose interpretations of him are affected by their preference for cosmopolitanism against his Judaism ignore the historic principle, that every genuine and fertile expression of the universal is expressive of a national consciousness. The universal speaks in concentrations of itself, and its most significant concentrations are in the genius of a nation. Shakespeare is the world's because he is altogether of England. American democracy serves all nations as it remains American democracy. Every great philosophy and each creative art is from a nation's soul. The exponent of the

national consciousness selects its essentials, deepens them and intensifies them into their universal significance. The forms of their truly national life are dear to him as revelations of the national spirit, germs of its evolutions among mankind. Not in vague generalizations do these potencies enter the world's life but as concrete, definite expressions of the nation's life formative of humanity.

The method of Jesus was to unveil to his people what was already in their hearts. His appeal was to their deepest convictions. Therefore his sayings largely coincided with the thought of their wisest leaders, who were included in the succession of revered expounders of the law, and the noblest of his contemporaries. He separated their best from inferior elements of their teaching which obscured and confused their best. He taught his disciples to pray in words that were familiar. When asked what is the chief commandment he quoted from the great confession of synagogue worship and household devotions. He showed his people their own implicit consciousness, therefore the highest vision. He gave them what was closest to them, therefore the deepest revelation. He found in Judaism law prescriptive and law spiritual. By three fundamental spiritual principles of the law, which are essentially one, and which were already in his people's life, he pursued his aim, to accomplish the will of God in Israel and through Israel, that for Israel and humanity there might be the life of God in man's soul and man's world.

IV

Jesus' consummation of God's law in spirituality and liberty, in accordance with its essential nature, was accomplished through three fundamental principles. They were not analytically distinguished from one another nor worked out dialectically. They were in the mind of Jesus

one supreme, all-inclusive devotion. Each depends upon the others and implies them. Their power is their vital realization in Jesus himself. From his life they regenerate human life. This threefold power is, first, his consciousness of the divine fatherhood as determining the law; second, his conception of the law's penetration of all the inner life of men, and from this penetration issues conduct transformed; third, his comprehension of the law's supreme principle.

The first of these three is so fundamental, central and all-inclusive, as to require a separate consideration, which will be attempted in the chapter entitled, "Jesus' Religion of the Father's Will." At this point may be mentioned: that the dependence of law upon fatherhood implies the Jewish conception of the indissoluble unity of fatherhood and sovereignty.

Outside the consciousness of Israel the two conceptions when found together are bound together rather than interfused. For example, in the ancient Roman law the paternal authority is independent of paternal love and responsibility. The father possesses it but it is not essentially fatherly. The real fatherhood is often present, for human hearts are human hearts, but if it is absent the sovereignty remains. The same external connection appears, though often in forms less harsh and rigid than the Roman, in ancestor worship and in the conceptions of other civilizations.

Therefore advancing thought tends to separate elements not indissolubly united. Other bases, other sanctions are found for law, as in the divine will when not conceived as altogether fatherly, or in the constitution of society, or in the order of the universe. From the Jewish home, where the mother, according to an exquisite passage of rabbinic literature, might be held in even greater reverence than the father, where, therefore, fatherhood includes mother-

hood, is formed and preserved the unity of fatherhood and sovereignty, of reverence and intimacy, of love and law.

The second element in Jesus' fulfilment of Israel's law is its penetration of the inner life, from which renewed source issues conduct transformed. In this emphasis upon the inwardness of the law Jesus was close to the best Jewish teachings of his time. It is no less true that in this respect he stood in sharpest opposition to certain Jewish teachings of his time.

The life of Israel in the law is a life of prayer. Failure to appreciate the unity of law and prayer in Judaism is failure to understand anything in Judaism. Its prayer—to speak of Jesus' day—wretchedly misrepresented by some who might have had the means of knowing better, was not to a God far away, accessible only through mediators, but was an obedient child's prayer to the sovereign Father. Personal life was full of it. Family life was fragrant of it. The service of the synagogue was not more for instruction than for the prayers, profound, simple, exquisite, filial in their reverence, joyous in their obedience, contrite in their gratitude, confident of the divine forgiveness and restoration, and of gifts of every good. Instruction and worship, law and prayer were indissoluble. Their purpose was one, the accomplishment of God's will. Israel's life of prayer in the law made the temple the place of prayer. "Men went up into the temple to pray." The sacrificial system had become, with whatever incongruities, the symbol of prayer. The morning and the evening sacrifice were calls to prayer. "Let my prayer be set before thee as incense, the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice." When the priest, like Zacharias in Luke's story, was engaged in his office the people were praying in the courts. The temple service became the symbol of Israel's united supplication. Its festivals were observed by prayer in every synagogue throughout the

world. To Jesus, as to his people, the temple was the house of prayer for all nations, where the world's appeal to God might find its consummation. Thus Israel's prayer, personal in each soul's intimate obedience to the Father, was supremely social.

In and through this life of prayer was the observance of the law, which was therefore an inner life. Yet into prayer itself intruded the formal and external, perverting the law at its source.

The confusion in Christ's day between law spiritual and law prescriptive has many historic parallels. The priest of the church teaches that obedience to her commands should be inward, spiritual obedience. He also insists upon every observance on the ground that it is authoritatively prescribed. Children who are being prepared for confirmation are often beautifully instructed in a spiritual devotion which commands our tenderest admiration, until we are saddened when we see the eager soul becoming more intent upon the regulations it must observe. So all through the history of the church up to mystical heights and on into superb devotions of sacrificial service, the two strands are bewilderingly entangled. In all branches of the church, in Judaism, in every higher religion, and in all human struggles up to them, the inner that emancipates is infected from the external that enslaves. Of the same essential nature are the confusions of faith and creed. Tremendous is the conflict between law and lawlessness; but of what incomparably deeper import in the world's history, in every human relation, in every life, in every soul, is the strife between law as the blindest leaders of Jesus' day conceived it and law as he attained it! For his great conflict he chose this battle-ground.

Within the obedient soul that has found itself free in the doing of the Father's will, even as God is free, the law attains larger meanings than can be embodied in any formu-

lations. The commandment against adultery becomes exquisite purity unapproachable by any gross imaginings. Then every woman is a holy being. The social life of men and women is set free for co-operations and interchanges whereby the world's life becomes both manly and womanly, and the love of man and woman is of soul to soul. The commandment against murder excludes antagonism to any man, and condemns those hostilities which are destructive of another's spiritual life,—condescension, contempt, censoriousness, aloofness and pride. What deepenings of the command, "Thou shalt not steal," are required of the commercialism and thievish luxury of our day! In the inwardness of Jesus every requirement of Israel's law unites itself with all normal human impulses which tend to the largest, strongest, finest life and with every opportunity of helpfulness that science or any other agency can devise, and becomes to the obedient, filial soul an inner divine reign and kingdom, creative of a new earth under a new heaven, a world of restorative forgiveness, of self-denying service without limit, of love which aspires to the perfectness of the universal Father.

The inner freedom of this obedience cannot be modified by any alien standard. It is absolute, transcendent of the world. Compromise is the futile attempt to serve two masters. This principle is revolutionary for each life, for all human relations, for the world's life. He in whom is this inner law stands above the world and all things in it. He is administrator of every event and situation. They cannot reach his inner sovereignty nor his mastery of things. He makes them his instruments. The kings of modern thought who find the interpretative and creative principle of the universe in the inner law are true disciples of Jesus.

There is involved no impairment of the world's work and its developments in any field of industry, social organiza-

tion, culture, conquest of the physical by the mind and will and soul of man. On the contrary secular failures, retrogressions, disasters are due to other principles and forces. To say that Jesus did not withdraw his disciples from secular affairs is a ludicrously inadequate statement. It is Paul, not Jesus, who counsels to "use the world as not using it to the full." What less than the conquest of all human affairs could that genuine Jew contemplate, whose Judaism is the accomplishment of the Father's will in every function and detail of Israel's life, and who accepts the declaration of Israel's prophets that through this divine achievement in Israel God's will is to be accomplished in the world's life? It is a blind judgment that imputes to Jesus a disregard of humanity's inevitable problem, the relation of the inner life to secular activities. He above all men looked this problem through.

The third element of Jesus' consummation of the law was his recognition of its supreme principle. His answer to the question, "Which is the great commandment?" is in part that which other eminent Jewish teachers might have given. Luke assigns it to a scribe in answer to a question put to him by Jesus. But the last part of the answer in connection with the first part constitutes a thought characteristic of Jesus.

Part of his answer is taken from Deuteronomy, the sixth chapter, the fourth and fifth verses, words so familiar and precious that the quotation of them in Palestinian Judaism was invariable: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." The word heart, in Old Testament psychology, includes all mental powers. The addition of the word soul constitutes inclusion of all human powers. The whole man is to direct all his powers in love to God, to the uttermost of devoted energy.

Jewish teachers have summarized Israel's law in the words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," from the eighteenth verse of the nineteenth chapter of Leviticus. Their interpretation of the word neighbour was not restricted to Judaism, but was universally human. The unity of Jesus' conception of love to God and love to one's neighbour—that is, to every man accessible to our helpfulness—is implicit in Judaism. Consummately Jewish is the great synthesis.

"The Golden Rule" which closes with the words, "for this is the law and the prophets," is essentially the same as Jesus' great commandment. An essential word of The Golden Rule is "therefore," which makes its ethic religious; for the preceding thought, from which it is derived, is of the universal love of the Father: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good gifts unto them that ask him: therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." The incomparable excellence of this saying is not only in the positiveness of statement, in which Hillel's negative statement is included, but also in its religious derivation, its identification with humanity's noblest spiritual ethical development; and all things that we would that men should do to us and that we do to them are determined by the love of God in us.

Law as prescriptive aligns its commands all on the same level. This level was, in the Judaism of Jesus' time, inconsistent with Judaism's deeper consciousness. The lower aspect excludes unity of spirit and aim. Life becomes fragmentary in a conventional observance. Then the letter kills and an ethic that is static not dynamic prevents developments of moral spiritual consciousness. The essential and purpose is lost. Then little minds em-

phasize the obvious and lighter things, tithing mint and anise and cummin in omission of the weightier matters of the law. The supreme principle on the contrary organizes, assigning to each observance its due place and scope. Conflict of duties does not occur to one who lives in the supreme principle. Observances which are subordinate and incidental are significant, dear and beautiful as, and only as they express law's supreme principle.

In Jesus' combination of the two ancient words of Israel's law, the religious and the ethical meet at their summits. And their converged summits are Jesus. The chief commandment attains its complete meaning when spoken by him, for all its terms he glorified. The God who must be loved is the Father as Jesus knew and loved the Father. The powers by which that love devotes itself to the Father's will are consummated in Jesus. The neighbour is every one whom his love can reach. The degree of neighbour love "as thyself" is estimated by that which each soul is to the infinitely loving purpose. And to know what love is we go to his cross.

God, neighbour, self, these three objects of devotion? How can there be three? There is but one. No man can serve two masters nor three nor any plural. Though no metaphysical system can claim Jesus, yet there is in him that unity of thought by which the search for reality must be guided. In the depth and centre of personal life each soul finds God the unity of all souls.

CHAPTER VIII

JESUS AND ISRAEL'S HOPE

To sum up our progress thus far in discovering the aims of Jesus as determined by his inclusive aim:—this aim, according to our hypothesis which is presented as a consistent interpretation of his career, was to accomplish the will of God in Israel and through Israel. This divine will he as Jew identified with Israel's law, which was consummated by his conception of God's sovereign fatherhood, by that deepening of the law in the inner life from which issues conduct transformed, and by the subsumption of the law under the supreme commandment. A consistent interpretation of Jesus' aim is the chief critical principle in the examination of the records of his ministry. Accredited critical methods in this field both test it and are illumined by it. The development of the hypothesis is by a process that is comparative and cumulative, but not circular.

I

The supreme aim, to accomplish God's will in Israel and through Israel, implies the supreme hope. The accomplishment of God's will brings the reign and kingdom of God. That consummation belongs to the future. Whatever the partial realizations and progressive victories, the reign and kingdom of God is a glory that is to come. If Jesus' aim had been a merely individual salvation, as Christianity has so largely perverted it, he could not have emphasized as he did the kingdom of God. Individualistic Christianity has taken little account of the conception,

except in weakened meanings, instead of which other terms are felt to be more appropriate. That accomplishment of God's will which is the penetration, by Israel's consummate law, of all human life in all relations of men to one another, in all the works which men do together, was to Jesus humanity's destination, both in this world and that which is to come. It is of universal scope. In all worlds and ages God's will is to be accomplished by the consummation of his universal law. The realization of the hope is God's gift. The all-inclusive prayer is, "Thy kingdom come." None the less the realization of the hope is the one heroic task, the task of Jesus, of his disciples, of the humanity created by his aim. This forelooking does not diminish the significance of the present. The great future things are ever present. The future realization is the present aim. Life is constituted in the task to fulfil the aim.

Our study of Jesus has brought us to the most difficult problem in the New Testament. What did he hope? But it is not an insoluble problem. We have seen what confusing influences affected the tradition in this regard from the beginning. We have seen enough of the aim of Jesus to guide us to the hope which it connotes. And we find in the Judaism of his day, which he completed, that hope of the kingdom to which he the consummate Jew attached himself. As the conception of Judaism's law contained two inconsistent elements, and as he accepted the higher, which he separated, clarified, fulfilled according to its own essential quality, so there were in Judaism different grades of its hope; and the highest was his, its accomplishment his aim. Many questions concerning his conception of that kingdom of God which his faith grasped and his life and death strove for must indeed remain unanswered. That which we shall find to be his revelation of the kingdom is written over by another con-

ception not only in the synoptic gospels but almost throughout the New Testament. But enough is decipherable for the guidance of humanity as it toils on in his leadership, to attain the Father's supreme gift, his reign and kingdom, the accomplishment of God's will in all the life of men.

II

A glance at the conditions of life in Palestine in the days of Jesus' ministry may help to an understanding of Israel's hope as then cherished. Though the economic conditions were not the most important in this respect, a mention of them is appropriate, since the practical things of common life always affect powerfully popular thoughts and aims and hopes.

The Palestine of Jesus' day lived under the Pax Romana, established by Augustus, pacifier and organizer of the most important part of the ancient world. This Roman peace, not then seriously affected by external pressure, was the chief economic determinant of the empire, including Palestine. Its reliefs from intolerable miseries, its stimulations of agriculture, crafts and commerce, its diffusion of prosperity, except where thwarted by local economic conditions, its encouragement of art and culture, we may appreciate by imagining our modern world released not only from the destructions of war but also from the national burdens and international restrictions which the fear of war entails. Many evils indeed remained, as great evils will still beset us even if the permanent peace we long for is secured. Beside such lacks as those of undeveloped physical and social science, that ancient life suffered from slavery and extreme inequalities, from degenerate moral sense and weakened religious faith, from repressions of nationality; and that creative impulse of thought and art and life which we call Hellenic was

enfeebled. Unanticipated evils were wrought by peace. Under Roman exaction and Roman insolence a heavy price was paid for the new blessings; but a price far heavier would have seemed cheap to the nations generally.

Palestine shared the benefits of the Roman peace. Definite knowledge of the economic life of Palestine is made difficult by our lack of statistical data, necessary to a clear estimate of economic conditions. We do not know the proportionate numbers of rich, well-to-do, poor, in the degrees of poverty, and paupers, of large landholders, peasant proprietors, renters and croppers, and labourers. The number of Jewish slaves held by Jews could not have been large, because of restrictions imposed by Jewish law. We are ignorant of the amount of commerce and crafts. The agricultural labourer's daily wage (as we judge from the words of a parable, "to every man a denarius," and from other data) indicates in real value a less extreme poverty of the labouring class than that of our contemporary Orient or of medieval Europe. Effects of indescribably destructive wars and massacres continued into the days of Jesus' ministry, but Jewish thrift and industry could make rapid recovery in a simple industrial organization. It was a period of economic improvement. There were advantageous connections with Jewish business in other lands. Jewish tourists from abroad brought money in. Jews of other parts of the empire made remarkably large contributions to the temple worship, which were distributed. There were many public and private gifts from the Diaspora.

Heavy taxes with bad methods of collection were oppressive but not often confiscatory. The Roman régime and the Jewish law united for a better security of life and property than had been usual in the ancient world. Josephus' roseate description of Galilee, which applies to the time of Jesus, with all its palpable exaggerations

could not have been written of a region unprosperous according to the standards of the age. The relief of poverty was inculcated by law and sentiment, though the economic science of charity was all but unknown. Uneconomic institutions of the Jewish law were evaded. The family organization involved care of aged and incapacitated members. Capability was fostered by the rudimentary education necessary for a knowledge of the law, by the general simplicity and frugality of Jewish life, by the relative infrequency of crime, by a standard of morals, especially in sex relations, unapproached by other peoples. The record of the evangelists, and notably the parables, show an active and varied life of a people by no means sunk in extreme want. Jesus' compassion for the poor was emphasized by the contrast of the fortunate. The simple industrial organization resembled our own in principle, and was not affected perceptibly by communistic experiments, so that we do not have to translate Jesus' teachings into another economic language. In conditions not abnormal by ordinary standards Jesus did a work which illumines the tasks of our own time.

III

The lack of independence under the Roman peace was not felt very sensitively by most of the Eastern peoples of the empire. Their previous history had been largely political servitude, and the Roman rule often increased their civic and personal freedom. They might worship whatever gods had a licence to receive worship, and the cult of the emperor was congenial to their syncretism. The weakness of their native gods even on the gods' own soil had been learned long before. National religious consciousness was too weak to be troublesome to Rome. But there was a marked exception, of a different religious

conviction. The God of monotheistic Israel is above the test that had put to shame the gods of the nations. "Thou shalt not test the Lord thy God." Perfect in moral qualities which are exalted above all vicissitudes he holds the stars and the peoples in the hollow of his hand and those who seem to rule are instruments of his unsearchable design. Yet they who are his people, the sheep of his pasture, expect deliverance since the Almighty has chosen them for his own. The selection which confers the highest national dignity prophesies the highest national destiny. The national consciousness is intent upon the deliverance of Israel.

Their longing is conspicuous among the irrepressible religious obsessions that have been more violent in history than any other passion. Israel's manifested itself in three different forms. Each, with its varieties and shadings, was essentially distinct from the others, notwithstanding inevitable mutual influences and borrowings.

One form, which may be called the revolutionary, contemplated rebellion against Rome. Though less intense in the days of Jesus' ministry than is represented in the evangelists, who knew it in its more violent phases, it was latent, with tremendous capabilities. In Jesus' childhood it had flamed forth in the revolt of Judas the Gaulonite, the suppression of which is a tale of incomprehensible horror. The sack of Jerusalem in the year 70 A.D. and Bar Cochbar's insurrection a little more than sixty years later reveal what it could dare and endure. Between Judas and the events precursory to the great rebellion the impulse had local and sporadic manifestations, many of which are hardly distinguishable from banditry. Barabbas is variously described in the gospels as a murderous insurrectionist and a robber. Patriotism as a cloak for brigandage is familiar in our day.

The strength of this impulse during Jesus' ministry

should not be exaggerated, nor its influence in shaping the conditions of his work. The evangelists' familiarity with the revolutionary tendency when it had become intensified must be discounted in their representations of popular feeling. The situation in general was not so bad that people could not adjust themselves to things as they were. The recollection of Judas' rebellion was a check to every sane man. Nor had Israel forgotten the infernal record and calamitous issue of the native Maccabaean tyranny. The detestable Roman governor's most exasperating atrocities came later, and resulted in his recall and exile. Shrewd Tiberius was not looking for trouble in Syria or anywhere. A Herod, vassal king in Galilee and Peræa, affected to be a Jew, as did other members of the Herodian family in their exiguous domains. Roman policy used them as palliatives of national discontents. A party, the Herodians, perhaps existent in Jesus' day, connected those degenerates with the hope of Israel.

The Sadducean "rulers" in Jerusalem were uncomfortable allies of Rome. The real religious leaders were, from nobler motives, advocates of peace, to be secured only by political submission. Rome was astute enough to grant a degree of autonomy sufficient for Judaism's observance of its law. The temple was Jewish domain, always on the condition of no disturbance there.

The political attitude of Jesus was unmistakably that of the religious leaders. His answer to the question of tribute to Cæsar is not in the least evasive. There is nothing unlawful in rendering to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, since Israel is permitted to render to God the things that are God's. This implication in his great utterance is for the sake of its deeper meanings.

On the other hand there must be considered that effect upon the revolutionary impulse which was occasioned by the work of John the Baptist. His preaching revived the

national hope. John was no advocate of violence. Luke's judgment, given in the form of John's pacific practical instructions, is historically correct. Yet John's imprisonment and execution were doubtless for political reasons, rather than for a possible personal resentment, with results novelistically described with obvious inaccuracies in the tale of Herod's birthday debauch. A popular religious leader, John or Jesus, inevitably affected the sentiment of rebellion. Best get John out of the way, imprison him first in a fortress off beyond the Dead Sea and have him quietly killed there later out of sight and out of mind. Jesus as popular religious teacher was exposed to the same danger. The increasing suspicion of the government, along with the misdirections of popular enthusiasm for him, forced his retirement from Galilee, to escape a premature and futile catastrophe. Faithfulness to the demands of his ministry faced that peril in Jerusalem.

Not all impulses to revolt were Messianic, for not all were of a religious nature; and in the religious motive the Messianic was not the dominant element. The Messiah was for the deliverance of Israel, not the deliverance of Israel for the Messiah. The greatest Old Testament prophecy of Israel's redemption, the second part of Isaiah, has no Messianic King. Judas the Gaulonite, unlike Bar Cochbar more than a century later, made no Messianic claim. The strongest emphases upon the Messianic Son of David, an invincible military leader like David, meet us in a later period than Jesus' day. Here again allowance must be made for the representations of the evangelists influenced by sentiments of the later time.

Yet earlier Jewish writings both in the Old Testament and in echoes from the Old Testament blended the hope of Israel with the invincible power of David's son. The ascription of Davidic descent did not wait upon genealogical investigation. The impulse to revolt connected itself

with such a Christ. A popular cause seeks its leader and is personified. Old Testament prophecies that make a Messiah the deliverer were familiar. When he comes to redeem Israel prudential considerations are effaced. What can resist the Lord's anointed? He shall drive the heathen from the Lord's inheritance as the wind sweeps the chaff from the threshing-floor. Wild fancies were engendered by this dream,—of the tokens of his coming, the exhibitions of his power, the result and scope of his triumph. A graphic picture of such extravagancies is impressionistically painted by the devil of the wilderness, in contrast with a nobler conception of Messiahship in Jesus' replies.

In the light of this expectation Jesus' "Messianic secret" was necessarily a secret. Publicly to proclaim himself the Christ in any sense (for how could his own Christ-consciousness be understood?) would inflame the spirit of unrest, altogether contrary to his purpose. Acceptance by him of that Davidic Messiahship is unthinkable and any ascription to him of any act or word suggestive of it is an unhistoric confusion. The tragic situation created by the popular notion has been indicated in a preceding chapter.

So from the world's conception of Christ and the cause of Christ the inveterate Davidic superstition falls away. In no age are the weapons of his warfare carnal. Every use of force by the church, whose history from Constantine down has been infected by it, has wrought the degradation of the church, the perversion of Christ's cause, and the blasphemy of his name. Civilization's requirements of force, in what functions and to what extent, is another question, whose answer can be gained only by the direction of civilization by his aims.

We come to the second form of Israel's hope. The important question here is whether this was the form of

Jesus' hope. His separateness from the other discloses qualities of him that assist our answer.

IV

Israel's hope was Jesus' hope. He did not accept the revolutionary aspect. Two others remain to be considered in respect to influence upon him. One of these is the apocalyptic form.

This is represented, aside from New Testament data, by a number of writings known as the Jewish apocalyptic literature. An early example is the book of Daniel. It was mainly written in the seventh decade of the second century before Christ, a date determined by internal evidence. Related to its eschatological conceptions are passages in Ezekiel, the book of Joel and the twenty-fourth to the twenty-seventh chapters of the compilation which is called Isaiah. The writings which are important for our consideration began with Daniel and continued on into the second century of our era. Those which have been preserved are connected with events which preceded or followed—in both cases by a considerable interval—the ministry of Jesus.

They contemplate in general no human effort for Israel's redemption, but a celestial power of deliverance. The near appointed time for the transcendent divine interposition may be computed, and reckoned again when its mathematic fails. The interval between the date of each composition and the end is to be filled with appalling sufferings and catastrophes. Each writer ascribes his work to some actual or legendary hero,—Enoch, Daniel, or whoever, who presents in veiled forms traditional notions of history down to the actual writer's day; then describes, often in even more grotesque symbolism, the contemporary situation as the author conceives it; and

beyond that point vaguely predicts, with the usual fortune of prediction. In the dénouement there descends from heaven, with pomps and blazonries, with irresistible power the judgment and redemption. In the book of Daniel, mother of apocalypses, there is real though fantastic genius, magnificent faith and religious patriotism, and traces of the great prophets. Within the apocalyptic writings generally these qualities are less evident. Though the writers employ the great monotheistic conception of Israel's faith and hope, it is in a representation inferior to extensive sections of Jewish literature of their period. Though their nationalism does not altogether exclude the prophetic universalism, yet narrow, repellent conceptions are frequent. This literature possesses obscured excellencies of Judaism.

With every appreciation and allowance, there is poverty of thought and weakness of invention, as always when imagination forsakes essential reality. Writers borrow apocalyptic apparatus from their predecessors. There are commonplaces of apocalyptic, wearisomely reiterated. As always the grandiose becomes banality and puerility. The attempted sublimity is empty of significance. There is indeed longing for redemption, confidence in the redeeming God, but the objects of faith are degraded from spiritual to material forces, no less material because transcendent. There is loss of religion's deeper consciousness. Into the void rush all manner of superstitions, vagaries, unworthy desires, hates embittered into exultation over the prospect of illimitable agonies of Israel's enemies and renegades. The numen of apocalypse is not the God of spiritual aspiration. Its world is not God's world, nor his its world to come. If we will recall that Jewish and Christian composite, roughly patched together, the last book of our New Testament, omitting the beautiful reliefs upon the grotesque structure, then its

materialism, barbaric stage scenery and devilish joy over the eternal tortures of innumerable human beings help us to understand why the genuine Judaism of Jesus' day felt no need of such supports of its hope.

When the expectation of a Christ is included he is a transcendent being who descends for Israel's deliverance with illimitable energies which need no human co-operation. Obviously he is superfluous. References to him are only occasional. Daniel has no mention of him. "One like unto a son of man" is evidently the people of Israel. When the Christ occurs he is taken over from Old Testament prophecy, or from polytheistic influence, or from the misinterpretation, found before Jesus' day, of Daniel's Son of Man, a Messianic title ignored by the Judaism of the synagogue.

It is not necessary for our purpose to discuss the origins of this literature except to mention that a considerable part of its notions, which coloured the whole mass, came from outside of Israel. Babylonia and Persia were prominent contributors. Such conceptions are to be distinguished from those which Israel accepted from the Gentile world because they were accordant with its own development. The outlandish borrowings were not dominant among those whose faith and life were shared by Jesus. It is not accordant with the interpretation of him as a man of his own time and people to suppose that he departed into that far country for these uncongenial views and shaped his life by them.

Just how far the apocalypses, or more accurately the conceptions expressed in them, were current, it is impossible to say. Prudence required that the writings and their doctrines should be circulated with care and secrecy, as was the book of Daniel under the Syrian tyranny. The necessity of guarding them tended to preserve them. Thus the fact that we have a number of them does not imply

that they were widely influential. They may have been the esoteric literature of a limited circle. It is evident that they and that which they represent had not the vogue and influence which have been attributed to them, but which are now contradicted by eminent scholars.

The apocalyptic interpretation of Jesus in modern studies of him belongs to the effort altogether praiseworthy to know him as a man of his own place and time, profoundly affected by the thoughts and aims of his own people. So we have found him to be the consummate Jew. This apocalyptic interpretation of Jesus is weakened when it is shown, as able scholars have shown, that this form of Israel's hope was not prominent in the Judaism from which he grew and which he fulfilled. The important consideration is that it is not found in the teaching which was given in the synagogue. From that instruction which, as we have seen, has been preserved to us, we have to learn the dominant Judaism of Jesus' time. When we turn from the genuinely Jewish consciousness to the apocalypses, we are in another landscape, climate, a foreign world under an alien sky. The religion of the synagogue was not denied by them. Their peculiar religious consciousness was not present in the synagogue.

The book of Daniel, mother of apocalypses, was in their Old Testament. But it did not stand among the prophetic writings and was not used in the stated readings of the synagogue. What was not read in public service could not have formed the thought of Judaism. The absence of the term, Son of Man, as Messianic title, has a bearing upon the question whether or how Jesus used that term.

A use of it by Jesus with reference to himself does not necessarily involve his adherence to the apocalyptic scheme which it generally connotes in the synoptic gospels. The Old Testament's Son of Man, which means man, has various associations there, as of man in his

weakness, in his dependence upon God, as recipient of the divine beneficence which crowns him with glory and honour. The synthesis of these conceptions belongs to that Son of Man who had not where to lay his head.

The gospel testimony to Jesus' assertion of the title in the transcendent Messianic apocalyptic meaning has a lack of corroboration in the other New Testament writings outside the gospels,—remarkable in contrast to the synoptic emphasis. Only in one of the three instances has it a claim to consideration as connected with the early tradition. This occurrence is in the book of Acts, in the account of Stephen's vision shortly before his martyrdom, and may well be the author's dramatic addition. Its repetition in the fourth gospel, in a modified meaning, needs no derivation except from the synoptics. Paul's complete omission of it in all that we have from him has had various explanations. The most plausible of them is that he had not heard it applied to Jesus. The situation is this: where we naturally look for corroboration of the evangelists' testimony to Jesus' Messianic use of the title, there is none. As far as we know, the early tradition went out into the world without leaving there a trace of the transcendent Son of Man. We are therefore referred to the unsupported testimony of the evangelists, and our judgment must weigh the significance of the synagogue teaching and of the religious consciousness of Judaism.

It is not necessary to follow the weakest line of attack, along the confusions of the narrative relating to Jesus' Messianic announcements. These inconsistencies are natural enough, and do not mean much. The least convincing statement of the apocalyptic Messiahship of Jesus is its most emphatic assertion, the thirteenth chapter of Mark and its elaborated parallels. No modern scholarship attributes to Jesus the eschatological statements of these extended passages. Its detailed and inaccurate

predictions are evidently formed from events subsequent to his ministry. Its nature is also betrayed by the words, "Let him that readeth understand." The essential unauthenticity of the *locus classicus* of synoptic eschatology demands a critical estimate of other apocalyptic passages and of apocalyptic colourings by words or phrases.

In other parts of the synoptic gospels we find indications that its eschatology is a growth, presumably through supposed revelations and inspirations. Jesus becomes the Christ at his resurrection, at his baptism, at his birth, a retrogression which the fourth evangelist extends to "the beginning." So in the final judgment he appears in different rôles of different prominence, as witness, as advocate, and as sole judge behind whom God disappears. His coming is to be before his disciples have finished a short missionary journey in the Holy Land, and after all nations have heard the gospel. The consummation is to be watched for every moment, and cannot be till after certain definite events. Most of these contradictions are ascribed to Jesus in his earthly ministry. They prepare us to recognize the most glaring contradiction.

Before presenting that, we may recall the influences which from the beginning of the early church made a transcendent eschatology its obsession. As has been said already, this does not involve an early influence from the Jewish apocalyptic writings or their conceptions. In subsequent elaborations of Christian eschatology whatever was congenial was admitted.

The supreme contradiction is between this interpretation of Jesus and what we know of him and his aims from other sources. More than a logical inconsistency is involved. One may have mutually opposing ideas, pursue trains of thought which are inconsistent with one another, and still maintain an integral life, an undivided soul. But to order one's life and service by aims that clash is

another matter. No such self-stultification can be imputed to him. The division goes deep. In the apocalyptic conception, there are impossible antinomies. The Jesus of humblest service is an oriental emperor. His closest companions, to whom he taught that humblest service is the highest rank, are satraps. Jesus is presented as a dual personality: one of him has perfect poise and sanity; the other is obsessed by that which has proved to be delusion. The apocalyptic sweeps away his gospel. It declares that the powers which rule the spiritual universe and effect the divine purposes are not spiritual after all. The spiritual universe, the reign and kingdom of God, is materialized. Its essential spirit is for a little while. The universal fatherhood ceases. Jesus' God and ours is dead.

No consistency is gained by the supposition that he expected another to be the Christ, or that he declined from the sane purpose of his early ministry into this enthusiasm, least of all that he went to Jerusalem seeking a violent death which would bring to earth by celestial irruption the apocalyptic kingdom. Yet this effort to interpret Jesus has not been fruitless for the world's better understanding of him. It has emphasized him as man of his place and time, one with history which he leads on. It has made prominent his devotion to a supreme hope. It issues in a just estimate of the least valuable, the most temporary conceptions of the New Testament, which are its apocalyptic dreams. Their intrusions into the tradition of Jesus' ministry and so into the synoptic record have made difficult the task of distinguishing Jesus' real hope, yet the essentials can be recovered all the more clearly because of the discriminative investigation forced upon us, for human guidance in all ages. In the presence of the Jesus whose aim was the accomplishment of God's will in Israel and through Israel by the consummation of

Israel's law, the blazonries of the apocalypse grow pale and the voices of its seven thunders die away.

V

Separate from revolutionary passions and apocalyptic vagaries the main current of Israel's life flowed with a steadfast hope for the salvation of the Lord, in which all the faithful of Israel are to participate, both the living and the dead. The manner of the deliverance was left to the divine mercy, wisdom and power. Though popular notions, as of body and soul, of earth and heaven, entered into it, and imagination was quickened by it, Israel's genuine, characteristic hope had no systematized eschatological scheme. The hope was too vital for that, as faith is too vital for formulations. The kingdom is to redeem this earth in its accomplishment of God's will here. This means the consummation of God's law in all the life and relations of men. The hope, like the law, might be conceived more or less nobly.

In this hope of Israel the higher and the lower expectations were determined by the higher or the lower conception of the law. As far as the law was felt to be external, prescriptive, so far did the thought of the kingdom connote lower, external goods. As far as the law was conceived in the direction of Jesus' consummation of it, so far were the expectations genuinely ethical and spiritual. So we find in the really representative writings and prayers of Judaism. The lower phase exulted in the destruction of Israel's enemies. The higher embraced the universal accomplishment of God's will through Israel when all the earth shall see the salvation of the Lord. Jesus' hope, if we indeed interpret him as man of his race and time, was the consummation of Israel's purer, broader hope. Our task of learning Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God,

though made difficult by apocalyptic intrusions, may be guided by the indissoluble unity of his expectation with his aim, which was the accomplishment of God's will in all the life of Israel and in all the life of the world through Israel. Those passages of the synoptic gospels commend themselves as true to his thought which are evidently free from apocalyptic conceptions.

The question, Did Jesus expect the kingdom to come soon?—is not clearly directed to his thoughts and aims. It assumes the apocalyptic expectation, which is a confusion of immediacy, preliminary woes and perplexed excuses for delay. We find in Jesus' own unmistakable proclamation something of a different nature. It is intensest urgency of immediate and entire acceptance of his evangel. Complete inner change is demanded, for the kingdom of God is at hand. When we clear our thoughts of apocalyptic imaginings, and when Jesus emerges to ethical and spiritual perceptions out of their mists, that incomparable urgency is historically justified. Historically urgent was the complete inner change, for Israel's supreme opportunity of spiritual leadership of the nations. Never in history has there been a clearer historic vindication than that of Jesus' incomparable urgency.

The kingdom is to be, but its powers stream into his ministry. The satanic strong man is bound, for the spoiling of his house. Only a forced interpretation from an inconsistent apocalyptic context can disguise the meaning of the saying, "The kingdom of God is in your midst." In this consciousness he speaks of his ministry as the realization of that which prophets and holy men had desired to see. There is in the world a greater fulfilment than any achievements of the past. John the Baptist, consummation of preliminary prophecy, need not doubt, when he is told of the beneficent works of Jesus, that his toils and prayers are answered. Therefore Israel, and every man in

Israel through whom the world is to be saved by the accomplishment of God's will in Israel, faces the supreme crisis. To reject the demand of complete inner change, is rejection of every good, is the judgment of incalculable loss, personal, national, universal. His challenge in the purification of the temple is the issue of judgment and redemption.

The question whether Jesus was conscious of himself as the Christ is answered not only by the early Christian community's immediate ascription to him of Messiahship, but also by his assurance, in all he did and strove for, that the Christ's work is his work. It was the illumination of immediate commission and endowment from the Father.

That reign and kingdom of God includes the relief of human woes. The hungry shall be fed, the mourners comforted and they that hunger and thirst for the establishment of God's righteousness in the world shall see their longings satisfied. Such sayings are to be interpreted in the light of those great prophetic demands for social righteousness and welfare of which Jesus' social passion is the consummation. These words are the fulfilment of the law that demands the accomplishment of God's will in every relation and co-operation of human life. And all that men can be in these relations works on into the highest spiritual life that men can receive, which the perfect fatherhood can impart. Jesus' own beneficent works are manifestations of the kingdom, signs of it because flowing from its spirit of inexhaustible sympathy and helpfulness.

Therefore the kingdom is a growth in the world. It expands like the mustard seed, it permeates like the leaven. He who gathered unmatched powers into a unique intensity maintains a serenity no less magnificent, in the consciousness that every force in the universe, with the implicit powers of the human soul and humanity, works for the attainment of God's purpose. The result he leaves to the Father, assured that the harvest will come.

To Jesus' Israelitish consciousness, the kingdom, wrought through the accomplishment of God's will in Israel, is not man's attainment but God's gift. It is reward but not desert. It is all of the gracious, forgiving fatherhood. When it comes and because it shall come, to God be all the praise.

In his conception of the kingdom appears the unhellenic Judaism, the consummated Semitism of Jesus. Not by secular evolutions, not by achievements of science in conquering the world to human uses, is the perfect day to come, but by spiritual energies. This vague phrase does not define the content of the spiritual. We find the concrete meaning in the aims and methods of Jesus. These converge in the accomplishment of God's will in obedience to his holy law, in Jesus' penetrations and consummations of it. To this fulfilment we bring our Hellenic contributions, and those which other civilizations offer and may develop. They are vehicles and instruments of his purpose, how transformed when directed by his aims!

No human thought can formulate the glory, joy, increasing wonder of that consummation, when the limitless scope of humanity's prayer is answered, "Thy kingdom come," when "all we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good shall exist." The mind all but annihilated can report to the soul only fragments, intimations of what shall be, expressed in forms which each inspired man and each aspiring age design from present experience, while the great joy of the imagination is its consciousness of inadequacy to that which the perfect fatherhood shall pour upon his children.

As we contemplate Jesus' hope we are conscious of another, the hope of heaven. To this Jesus' aim and faith answer: Your work is here. Yours is an element in humanity's one task, to achieve in this world that accomplishment of God's will whereby his kingdom comes.

From Jesus we acquire intensifications of our work in the world and of its potential values in God's redemptive purpose. The extreme selfishness that is devoted to its own heavenly gratification excludes all real values. Nor is that selfishness overcome when its expectation is extended, however far, to men in individualistic perversions of life. The kingdom of God is the absolutely social conception. In it personality is socially conceived, socially achieved in the one God in whom is the unity of all souls. Therefore its values are eternal values. What value in heaven that is not the kingdom of God! Jesus' hope of the life eternal is embraced within his hope of the kingdom of God. In its eternity is the eternal life of all its citizens. It extends as far as the Father rules who is Lord of heaven and earth. No distance in the immeasurable universe is beyond its scope. Jesus' aims are universal and eternal. To concentrate these purposeful energies upon the work which is next our hands is to possess the universality, the eternity, of the kingdom of God.

VI

Two inconsistent interpretations of Jesus' aim beside the apocalyptic are prominent. One may be called the ecclesiastical. According to this view Jesus came to found the church.

The reason for considering this conception will be given presently. Except for that, the institution of vast prominence in the world would have no place in a discussion of Jesus' life and teachings. No modern scholarship which is so free from ecclesiastical pressure that it can examine and report the facts, holds to the authenticity of any saying ascribed to Jesus concerning the church. The pertinent passages have been referred to near the close of the fifth chapter. Institutions of the church cannot be found as from him, neither clergy (for the elastic circle of apostles

did not constitute a clerical order) nor sacrament. He did not practise nor command baptism. The Last Supper with his intimate disciples was sacramental because every expression of devoted love is sacramental. Yet the mention of this theory of Jesus' aims has an important reason. The church is an inadequate rendering of a greater and purer creation.

He created the "beloved community" of those who in his discipleship work together to accomplish the Father's will. The first acceptance of his gospel united disciples into an eternal fellowship with one another and with him. He worked and works ever in the communion of the common task. The prayer which is called The Lord's Prayer belongs to the beloved community, which is a fellowship of prayer. Sharing with their Master his thoughts and purposes they share them with one another. It is a fellowship in him. It sweeps into itself the natural unities of human fellowship. Its members are in all places, in all normal relations to one another, for the accomplishment of the Father's will. Sacrificial devotions to the church become incomparably deeper when they find their true object.

It belongs to a later chapter to mention the place of the church in the service of the beloved community, that the church may be expressive of its spirit and aim. That the church must be unpretentious, simple, elastic for this purpose is obvious, and it is obvious that fundamental changes are required.

Of a different spirit from the ecclesiastical interpretation is that thought concerning Jesus which is occupied with his work for individuals, with his devotion to each soul. The rebuke to the Pharisees which is expressed in the parable of the shepherd who goes into the wilderness to seek the lost sheep until he finds it, condemns not only their aloofness, but also their solidaric conception. Israel was

often thought of as something apart from each soul in Israel. The joy in heaven is not because aggregates are saved, but because a person is saved, from his own sin, through his own repentance, by the Father's personal love to him. The poignant appeal to Jesus of every human need, the unbounded significance to him of each soul, his sublime personal intimacies, show that he, perhaps alone among the champions of great causes, never made his cause in the least impersonal.

In the companionship of his thoughts one walks among the jostling crowd of a city street and greets with a longing reverence each illimitable human universe. One stands with Jesus beneath the stars, and against repressions of immeasurable spaces maintains the worth to God of one's own soul. In comparison every thing and the immensity of things becomes insignificant: how much more our sordid material estimates of values and achievement! Let every other external good be lost if only the soul is saved! With Jesus nothing comes into consideration against the soul and its salvation. What effort too intense, what resources too rich to be expended upon any element or experience of a soul's life! No human being is to be adjudged too base to be brought back to himself and to the Father. No injury from him can diminish sacrificial toil for him, no brutal opposition repress the redemptive purpose. Yet all our consciousness of personal values, with all their reverences and compassions, are but faint reactions to the heart of Jesus. In this recognition it is truly said: "He died for every man"; "He loved me and gave himself for me."

The conception of Christianity as personal salvation, to the obscuration of its social power, occurred very early in Christian history. It was this, as has been noted, which repelled Judaism whose nature is to direct all human relations according to God's law. Paul in his wide mission

did not contemplate a moulding of secular organizations. His spirit and that of the author of the fourth gospel and of the New Testament generally is indeed love from the love of Christ, in personal relations, but not conscious of power to transform human institutions. Jesus' kingdom of God became in early Christianity partly a transcendent expectation, partly an intense but narrow personal experience. Jesus' conception of that inner life is far deeper because to him a world-transforming power.

That which we love and reverence in every man is the human. That word is not a mere classification, does not express an abstract conception, but signifies the participation of each in the life of all. Growth in personality is growth in this social consciousness, whereby all other human lives, with all their experiences, are creatively received into one's own personality, which fulfils itself by pouring its highest attainable personal good into their lives. Here is the unity of the two great thoughts, that the gain of the whole world does not profit if the soul is lost, and that only by its own loss is the soul saved.

This social manhood is formed not in mere sentiments and sympathies, but in the relations of men to one another, in the works that men do together. These works are nothing lower than the enlargement and enrichment of each soul in its life from and in and unto every soul.

The aim of Jesus is as concrete and definite as it is universal. It is a new task for every phase of civilization and for every element of every phase. It intensifies all human powers, energizing the functions of government, the efficiencies of industry, the conquest by science of earth and sea and air and sky to the knowledge and use of men, the creative expression of nature and human life in literature, music, painting, plastic art and philosophy, the control of the elements of man's being, the mastery of social forces. It is creative of them all. Unexplored, unimagined re-

sources of combined human powers await the apprehension of Christ's aim. It is a new task for every personality in all personal social developments, achievements, victories, which are new in every person. It is a simplification of the inexhaustible variety which it vitalizes, for it gives direction and unity. It makes all things spiritual when all are from and in and unto the Father's will.

CHAPTER IX

JESUS' RELIGION OF THE FATHER'S WILL

I

The aim of Jesus, which was the accomplishment of God's will in Israel and through Israel, distinguishes him from those religious leaders whose chief endeavour is to know God by an intellectual process, or by contemplative mysticism. These two are akin to each other, both in their historical connections with one another, and in the contemplative nature and aim of the intellectual process that seeks to know God. To such religious leaders there seems to belong an incomparably greater profundity. What comparison between the illimitableness of the deepest religious consciousness of India, which identifies itself with the One ineffable, and the childlikeness that asks what God wants done? That intellectual leadership includes Hellenic thinkers and their medieval and modern heirs; also the creators and organizers of what is called Christian thought, such as Origen, Athanasius, Aquinas, and those who, like Hegel, have carried out the work of the theologians to its inevitable issue, a system of metaphysical conceptions. Here is also the contemplative mysticism of Neo-platonism and its successors.

The differences among the intellectual or mystical seekers after God, in Christendom or beyond, are less than their differences from Jesus' way. More akin to him are the religious leaders who have been occupied with the will of God, as Zoroaster, Mohammed, Augustine, Duns Scotus, Calvin, however great their divergencies from Jesus concerning God's will and its aim. Kant and Fichte,

who recognized in the will of man the conviction of God, approached his method, though far from his luminous simplicity. Contemporary movements of thought called voluntaristic, pragmatistic, activistic, are seeking a way which leads to Jesus' way.

To the religious consciousness which is occupied with God's will, that will is not a separate divine attribute but is all of God energizing. This type of religion is not concerned with speculative questions about deity. It does not ask to comprehend the depths of divine being and the nature of God's metaphysical relation to the physical universe and to the human soul. The problems of this faith are the practical questions, What will God have us do, with him, in the world of nature and of man? The answers are achieved in the doing of his will. Thus to relate oneself to the supreme will, to pursue its aims as our obedience discloses them, is a knowledge of God with which the devoted, serviceable soul is satisfied. As we know any man best by working with him so we know God best by working with God. We do not stop to reason why. In particular the problem of evil is to be solved by God's redemptive working, in which is our task. Our knowledge of God is content to be ever incomplete because it increases continually with what God wills to do in our co-operations with him. That knowledge is open to every serviceable intent. The way of practical righteousness is the way to him. In this religious consciousness the intellectual powers find the consummation of their function, which, as our modern psychology holds, is the service of life's practical tasks. Every intellectual ability is directed to the clarification of the supreme, inclusive task. To this are aroused all human potencies, all the interrelations of human activities, industrial, political, scientific, cultural. Religious feeling is intensified by its purpose. The concentration of every power upon that

which God wills is union with God. This is the life of God in the soul of man.

Jesus, true Israelite, is the consummation of Israel's religious consciousness. Israel's prophets, lawgivers, psalmists, were not speculative metaphysicians. It is no longer proper to say that they lacked metaphysical ability, now that mighty currents of metaphysical endeavour are concentrated upon their method, which was his in whom their religious consciousness was fulfilled. Not by intellectual processes did they attain their ethical monotheism. They won their sublime appreciations of the divine righteousness by a process and in a consciousness which finds the religious and the ethical to be forever one.

Significant of this type of religion is the characteristic mysticism of the great prophets and of Jesus. It is the mysticism of the immediate compulsion of the divine will, no less a direct mystical experience for its ethical preparations. It is of a fundamentally different nature from that mysticism which experiences or imagines the ineffableness of divine being, and is absorbed into the obliteration of all distinctions, therefore of all activities. The visions and auditions in which the religious experience of Israel is expressed are of a task conferred for the accomplishment of the will of God. For that purpose is given the revelation of the divine holiness, of God as holy will, supreme in the overwhelming majesty of divine power. The most sublime of these visions, that of Isaiah's call to prophecy, issues in God's summons for an executant of his will and in the response, "Here am I, send me," which can be uttered only by one whose lips the fire of the divine holiness has purified. The account of Jesus' vision at his baptism lacks indeed any witness, nor is there any real evidence that his experiences took ecstatic forms, visual or auditional; of these his spiritual intimacy with the Father had no need. Yet that narrative is truly expres-

sive of the mysticism of Jesus, in the sense of immediate receptiveness to the will of God. So from his nights of prayer he came, in the power and direction of the divine will, to toil for its definite purposes. Christianity as learned from Jesus is deepest and closest mysticism. But it is not of the cloister. It is not of that Hellenic strain which culminated in Plotinus and continued from him in Christianity. It is not Brahmanic. It is ethical mysticism, receptive of that which God will have us do, and divinely empowered to do it. It is the soul penetrated by the divine will.

The religions of the divine will are religions of power. Even when they reduce man to a mechanical instrument, the deterministic consciousness of that will's indwelling energy is capable of world-controlling activities. Mohammedanism has been a religion of power. Calvinism's interpretation of Christianity has wrought great things, as men have felt themselves the weapons of a purpose which renders every opposition futile, and every competition contemptible. Nothing else is to be cared for or considered. The fading out of the consciousness of the supremacy of the divine will is largely responsible for the pitiful weakness of our hesitant modern faith. Yet the impulse of a deterministic religious consciousness, when it reaches the stage of critical reflection upon its own nature, inevitably decays. The predetermined instrument discovers that he is not co-operant and the impulse to action is left without a reason. Or if he refuses to reflect, it is the refusal to develop his own spiritual potencies, so that he is unequal to new demands. Then a religion of the divine will becomes a narrow, destructive fanaticism. Whenever the power of this type of religion develops, as in Israel, it is because of the recognition of that personal and social fulfilment in the will of God which Jesus brought to its complete meaning.

A religion of this class may construe the nature of that will from physical forces, or from the sum of them, or from a power over them which is conceived as essentially physical,—from omnipotence as a physical attribute of deity. Or the will of God may be an inscrutable fate. Often its model is human tyranny, not essentially transcended when all human kingships pale before the sovereign of the universe. Or the divine will may be a composite of such elements. Even if it is assumed to be altogether beneficent, the relation of man to God is that of instrument or slave. In Jesus' faith was fulfilled the Semitic unity of sovereignty and fatherhood. Jesus looked to the fundamental human experience for the revelation of the supreme will, even to human fatherhood and motherhood. He found the responsive religious consciousness in the little child.

II

The simplest act of Jesus was to take little children up in his arms and lay his hands on them and bless them. His most fundamental and far-reaching criticism was his rebuke to his disciples when they tried to stop little children from coming to him. It is significant that he recognized the impulse of the children to come to him and his own attractiveness to them. His disciples' ungraciousness to the parents he construed as an affront to the little child. Jesus' profoundest thought is expressed in the words, "Of such is the kingdom of God: verily I say unto you" (you who would stop the children), "he who will not receive the kingdom of God as a little child enters not at all into it." The authenticity of the scene and words consists in their perfect expression of his aim, the complete utterance of his religion of the Father's will.

Where this scene is represented in stained-glass windows of our churches, those whom Jesus takes in his arms are

pretty and healthy children, as if selected from our choicest Sunday-schools. Their becoming clothes, in the harmonious colour-scheme, have not a patch or rent or stain. Clean, well-combed, properly mannered, they would not soil or rumple a white silk gown. No shadow of the world's sorrow or sin is on their faces. One does not need to have the spirit of Jesus to desire the æsthetic pleasure of taking such children up in one's arms.

Doubtless those who brought their little ones to Jesus made them as presentable as they could, according to their limited abilities and simple notions. But we enter into the spirit of the scene when we remember that it was always the poor whom he attracted. If they had been stained-glass-window children the act would have had no more significance than the stained-glass windows have. It should be noted also that they were brought to Jesus that he might touch them, in the belief that his touch was curative. This brings before us children, sickly, blear-eyed, with unsightly sores, whom he took up in his arms, and he blessed them, laying his hands upon them. Of children just as children, whatever their deficiencies and impurities, who represented the child's need of love and care he said, "Of such is the kingdom of God."

Jesus was speaking of that which belongs to every child, of that which constitutes every child's life. He was speaking of that distinctive quality of childhood which makes it the pattern for all who receive the kingdom of God and so fulfil the condition of entering into it. He said, "Little children," in their complete childhood. What Jesus expressed is as simple and natural as childhood: it is a simplicity and naturalness from which many obscurations have to be removed.

There must not be read into Jesus' act and words any sentimentality. He never sentimentalized: he always faced realities. Whatever our behaviouristic psychology

has to tell of the child's resemblance to the brute is admissible into his estimate, which was founded upon the actual facts of childhood.

Jesus' attitude does indeed express appreciation of childhood's natural loveliness,—alas! how obscure in many unfortunates! That loveliness appealed to him whom the world of nature also charmed, in both cases beyond the comprehension of his reporters, through whose meagre and incidental references we may pass into his joy in natural and human beauty. And in children in whom that loveliness was obscured and distorted, repulsive to a vision less clear than may be learned from him, he saw childhood as essentially beautiful. And this beauty was to him the expression of something that makes the little child the leader of those who would enter the kingdom of God. This fundamental, universal quality is receptiveness, "To receive as a little child." What is the nature of the receptiveness, that it must be said of them, "Of such is the kingdom of God?"

It was evident in that scene what these dependent beings were receiving and how they received it. Brought by their parents who cared for them, fed them, clothed them, carried them before they could walk, then led them along paths made clear for little feet,—it was just the parents' rule of love and tenderness and guidance which they received, and to that belonged the exquisite expression of Jesus' fatherliness, and blessing from his Father and theirs. And how did they receive? The most intimately receptive words, such as trust, confidence, are inadequate. Let us say instead: as a little child receives.

A child's life is from and in and unto the parents' life. This is childhood. Here is not the limitation but the recognition of the child's personality, which is formed by its receptiveness of just this its childhood. Its thoughts, feelings and desires depend, even for their spontaneity,

upon the parents and are within a life encompassed by fatherhood and motherhood. The wanderings of the little feet turn back home for the indispensable love and care. If that love and care is removed for a moment, or if there is a fear of its loss, the child's heart is in unrelieved distress. The foundation and contents of its life are swept away. Here is a relation natural, inevitable, but it is more than that. It is moral, personal, therefore spiritual, because it is received, in the responsive action and freedom of the child's personality. To receive the reign and kingdom of the Father as the little child receives, this is the acceptance of Jesus' religion of the Father's will.

III

The relation of the child to the parent is more than an illustration of the relation to the heavenly Father. The formation of the child's life and personality from and in and unto the parents' life, the receptiveness which fills the natural relation with ethical and spiritual quality, all this is a direct relation to the eternal Father. Jesus called God Father, expressed his religious consciousness by the fundamental and universal human relation, because in every fatherhood and motherhood God is. They are not only from him, but of him and in him. Else we could not trace them from him. The supreme giver gives himself in his best gifts. In every father's care God cares for us. Every mother's smile is the radiance of the divine heart. The child, receiving these fatherings and motherings, takes God into the ultimate springs of life. Therefore in some further reflections upon Jesus' religion of the Father's will, which are selected almost at random from its inexhaustible treasures, it will not be necessary to distinguish between the child's relation to human parents and the religious consciousness that receives the

Father's will as a little child receives; since it is all of him from whom every fatherhood in heaven and on earth is named.

"As a little child":—here is the complete naturalness of every man's relation to the heavenly Father. A human being is not originally outside that fatherhood, to be transferred into it in a supernatural manner, either by an ecclesiastical rite or by a miraculous experience. The baptism of infants was unknown to early Christianity. Jesus did not institute it, for he did not command baptism at all. The baptism of children, when regarded as the exact opposite of the ecclesiastical meaning, and as the sign of what they are to the heavenly Father, when the child is brought to Jesus that he may take it up in his arms and declare its infinite significance to the heart of God, is so beautiful as to be inevitable. It is also in harmony with the baptism of Jesus, which was the consecration of an unspoiled soul. But to baptize as a condition of salvation, to say after baptism, "This child which is now regenerate," to think of the child as rescued out of an unfilial condition to a filial standing (just as if something more than birth were necessary to make the newborn the mother's own) is the denial of Jesus' thought and act and word. To regard a human being as a member of a reprobated race, is to assume an impassible barrier between God and man.

Such indignations may appear to be a turning away from thoughts germane to our time, to smite the corpses of antiquated superstitions. But these are not as dead as they ought to be. Not only are they current among the majority of those who profess and call themselves Christians, but there are also strenuous efforts to assert them. The denial of the faith that men are God's children is equally expressed in language doctrinal or materialistic. No essential difference from dogmatic paganism

is in that unbelief in men, contempt for men, exploitation and neglect of men, which is based upon the denial of men's essential spirituality which to Jesus is sonship to the divine fatherhood. Beneath all animal inheritances, perverted through the generations, though the perversions of these inheritances are not a part of them, beneath all the sin of the world there remains the essential childhood to the eternal Father.

Not by any unnatural experience can a man enter the kingdom of heaven. Whatever may have aroused the desire to enter, and whatever things, true or false, normal or abnormal, may accompany the entrance, salvation is just to receive the reign and kingdom of God, which is the Father's will, as the little child receives. Christianity is indeed the religion of redemption,—of redemption to that which is fundamental and natural. To what else could we be redeemed? To what could we return but to our Father's house? How could we come to ourselves except in the determination to arise and go to our Father? Christianity above every other religion confronts and condemns human sin, because it recognizes sin as the repudiation of the essential being of a man,—a child of God not receiving his fatherhood.

Passing on to the content of the child life whose basis has been thus briefly mentioned,—it is impossible not to make prominent in our thought its joyousness. It is natural joyousness welling up from the animal life which is spontaneous in the child. Here is the disclosure of the prevalent joyousness of all life. In human childhood, as also among the higher animals, the joy of living is dependent upon the parents: it is the child's joy in their love and care, a joy that fills the life encompassed and penetrated by fatherhood and motherhood. In it is the potency of unmingled sorrow, comfortless grief. There is nothing of deeper pathos than a neglected child. There

is no tragedy more poignant than a child fatherless and motherless, than a soul, a humanity without the Father. Where there is real childhood, in the relation indispensable to it, all natural joy is both set free and transcended. Its transcendent fulfilment makes the disciple of Jesus happy in the enjoyment of every normal good, as the Father's gift which contains his love as its essential joy. There was never such natural and deep happiness as in the heart of him who is called no less truly the man of sorrows. Jesus tells of its power to exclude the devastating anxieties of the unchildlike life, which are impossible to the confidence that "your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." True childhood is guarded against such abnormal sorrows. In the garden thus defended all plants of joy may grow; and the supreme joy is filial confidence, love responsive to the Father's love. The sorrows which need to be for discipline and service open into the greater joy which the Father has prepared, into which the Father leads. Therefore we his children are not overwhelmed by any griefs, and the deepest joy is at their heart. Our time, in reaction from the miseries it has endured, is demanding joyousness. It rightly applies to Christianity this test, whether it makes its disciples inwardly happy, creators of a happy world. Many current methods of seeking the spirit of joy are prolific of miseries. Many dull the heart to the pleasures of the deeper values. Yet this estimate of life as normally joyous is located in that realm of truth where children dwell who are happy in the Father's love and care.

But fatherhoods and motherhoods, even in families worthy to be called Christian, are, with exquisite exceptions, so impaired, so obscured by folly, impatience, insensibility! Therefore the child's relation to the parents falls far short of that which is its nature to be. We need

the normal expression of fatherhood and motherhood, to know the full meaning of the words that say of little children, whose life is essentially from and in and unto the Father, "Of such is the kingdom of God." What we need is supplied in the fatherliness of Jesus, of which his acts and words are the incomparable outshining. This was the sublimation of his impulse of fatherhood. No little child of his own ever nestled in his arms. That satisfaction had been precluded by the early dawning upon him and the forming within him of the consciousness of a mission which his Father would reveal to him in its time, a work which would permit no entanglements and which no one could share with him, and for which even the beauty and holiness of marriage and fatherhood must be sacrificed. Therefore God recompensed him with the spiritual and universal human fatherliness. He that has seen Jesus taking the little children up in his arms has seen the Father. Here is revealed the child life which true parenthood creates. To be a father or a mother is to be what Jesus was to those little children; to love them whatever their deficiencies; to bring them into closest intimacy, even as he took them up in his arms; to guard them against any harm, as he defended them against the extreme injury of his disciples; to make our whole being a self-impartive and God-impartive blessing to them, as he blessed them, laying his hands upon them. And child life, formed and encompassed by the parents' life, is what these little children were in his fatherliness and God's.

Children at home in the Father's heart are at home in the Father's world. This acceptance of the vast, mysterious universe, with all its pains and perils and disasters, as a friendly universe, ministrant to human growth and blessedness, an illimitable realm in whose conquest is the winning of man's illimitable powers, is expressed in the

grateful and exultant prayer, "Father, Lord of heaven and earth."

The authenticity of the words is in their true expression of Jesus' consciousness of God and of God's world. This genuineness extends to the order of the words, "Father, Lord of heaven and earth." From the divine omnipotence, supposed to be disclosed in heaven and earth, men have sought to deduce the divine benevolence. To God's power they have tried to add his love. The endeavour encounters two great difficulties. If our thought begins with the immeasurable frame of heaven and earth, it is hard to discover there an omnipotence that is more than the cosmic order. Many thorough thinkers have pronounced the undertaking impossible. But even if that could be done, what way can be found to deduce benevolence from power? The field which is open to such arguments is, in the limitations of our ignorance, an exiguous part of the great all of things; and even from that realm the data are uncertain, contradictory. Jesus' cosmology was formed from the opposite method. Having, as always a little child, recognized the divine fatherhood in fathers' and mothers' care and tenderness, he recognized in that fatherhood the lordship of heaven and earth. What that is lower than fatherhood can be supreme in all worlds? He who receives the will of God as a little child enters the universe of the Father's love.

In the faith that fatherhood is Lord of heaven and earth there is nothing in life or death or beyond death which the child needs to fear. The mysterious courses of our lives, their accidents, defeats, deprivations, sorrows even unto the cross, no less than the innumerable surprises of joy, are in the guidance of the fatherhood which is Lord on earth as in heaven, in each event and in the coherence of the cosmos. This is faith in God's fatherhood of redeemable humanity, his child. It is faith in his tenderly benef-

icent purpose in the sparrow's fall, and in his evolution of all being to unimaginable unfoldings of worth and joy.

In this faith there dawns upon us the consciousness of higher purposes than our weak self-indulgencies desire. It is the Father's aim that his children shall be like himself and co-operant in the accomplishment of his will. Without this implication dependent faith does not express childhood's deepest meaning. The child's life does indeed begin in this dependence and ever continues in it, but evolves in that receptive fulfilment of it which is the aim and therefore the nature of childhood. Childhood receives by learning the parents' will and sharing their tasks. With every power directed and energized we strive for that co-operation with God, that energizing of his will in us, that accomplishment of it through us which Jesus realized in his perfect sonship.

The child fulfils dependence in obedience. This is his inclusive duty. In this his moral nature begins. In this his will forms itself and becomes conscious of itself. In obedience he escapes the domination of natural impulse, sublimates the animal nature into spiritual personality. There is not the enforced submission of a slave but the obedience of a child, truly human when he happily obeys. A parental will is fatherly and motherly when it is not imposed from without but so imparts itself to the child's heart and soul that he fulfils it as his own spiritual impulse. The commands of father and mother unify themselves in the supreme commandment of love. Thus Jesus' three interfused consummations of the divine law are founded in the very nature of childhood, in the normal relation of every father and mother to every child.

Much of the parents' life is a mystery to the little child. Conditions of their care he cannot understand. When they take him on a journey they know his unknown way. Faith is deepened by the mysteries of fatherhood and

motherhood. In the darkness of the cross before the final darkness Jesus prayed, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." In the heroisms, the mightiest self-affirmations of the soul, there is that trust of the Father's guidance which is confident of the accomplishment of the Father's will and of one's own life united with it, fulfilled in it. In the thick of storm and battle, thoughts and hearts are guarded by the peace of God.

The child brings requests to father and mother, brings will in devotion to be guided by their will, offers the happy tribute of thanks. All that prayer is we find in these expressions of child life. In its dependence, obedience, gratitude, it is the life of prayer, which indeed has its concentrations but need not be solicitous about them, for the child's whole life is prayer.

The parents' care is an individual care. No two children have the same need and capacities. To foster and develop each personality, all its powers in their personal harmony, is the wisdom which fatherhood and motherhood receive from the supreme Father. Thus Jesus' religion of the Father's will is the opposite of abstract and general: it is as concrete and distinct as each human life. The Father's will is the complete and harmonious development of the potencies of each soul. The interests of the other members of the family have to be considered. But this principle does not diminish the life of any child, since each finds his life in interchange and unity of life with the others when the Father's rule and kingdom is accepted by all. The will of the Father is the harmonious development of each personality in the complete development of all.

It is the family life into which the child enters, to accomplish his childhood in the duties and affections of the family. The wedded love which is inspired by the Father to accept fatherhood and motherhood from him finds in that inspiration the impulse to provide child companion-

ship for the child. Else fatherhood and motherhood are incomplete in the incompleteness of the child's life. The family life of brotherhood and sisterhood fulfils childhood in receptive and impartive love, which is from and in and unto the parents' life. Whatever one child does for another is the accomplishment of the will of parenthood through him. Normal children are fatherly and motherly. They are bound together in the love of the parents for one another and for them all. Each is a social personality in the accomplishment of the Father's will. That he may fill his place in the family life he learns what its social tasks are and what the needs are that direct the tasks. The family life is the school of mutual service. The duty is joy. The service is the life of love. In family service souls are served, life and character are ministered unto. It is the joy and love and sacrifice of the parents in the child who serves. The command of Jesus to receive the reign and kingdom of God as the little child receives, means that the whole world is God's family, and that the child-like are in the kingdom of God, disciples of Jesus' religion of the Father's will.

Thus we find as always that the deepest spirituality of Jesus, the most dependent and intimate communion of the soul with God, is just for that reason the ultimate social gospel. All human relations and activities are included in that spirituality. In the filial and fraternal democracy of Jesus there is no difference of privilege. No good can be unimparted, no trouble unrelieved, no sorrow uncomforted. No one may lord it over another. Rank is determined not only by the devotion but also by the humility of service. Each child's good is the joy of all the other children and the Father's joy in them all. Whatever a father does for my brother and sister he does for me in the increase of my filial and fraternal life. Parental love is as such undivided: the whole of it belongs to each

child, could not belong to one if it did not belong to all. In each and in all it is direct, personal. Here is the source of heroic devotion even unto the cross. No obstacles can prevent, no terror daunt the doing of the Father's will for all the children. Here is energy and achievement in every field from which life can be enriched. Here is the organizing power for all the relations of men to one another, for all the works which men do together. The divine sovereignty and the divine fatherhood, God's kingdom and God's family, are here in indissoluble unity.

The relation of parent and child, which is the essential of childhood, continues in the later years. The parental and filial intimacy deepens as life deepens, expands as life expands. The filial man is all the more a child; the significance of his childhood forms the wisdom of maturity. One has said, "For the solution of my problems of life and work I go back to my childhood, orient myself by its memories, find from them what I am, what it is I have to do, and by what ways." There is continual entrance into the parents' thought and soul, all the more vital and penetrative when there are marked differences from them of endowment and vocation. The parental service to the world must be continued all the more vitally in different works in a different time. The appropriation and continuance of the parents' life is most deeply felt in its richness and responsibility when they have passed from earth, and the communion of the task together is intensified. The essential of childhood grows always. Eternal is the love life of father and mother and child, of the Father and his children.

As long as God lives every child of his must live. Each is infinitely dear to him. What can pluck them out of his hand! But this assurance of life eternal which belongs to Jesus' religion of the Father's will is more than a dependent

consciousness, and not at all a passivity. The soul that has given itself to the accomplishment of the Father's will has received into its inmost life that will's eternal powers. Its assured hope of the hereafter is of a life accomplishing eternally the inexhaustible aims of the Father's love, and developing powers for tasks forever new. There is no limit to God's aims nor to the life that is one with them.

The recognition of the little child,—"Of such is the kingdom of God"—is gospel of forgiveness and redemption to those who are not like the little child. To Jesus sin is unchildlikeness, goodness is childlikeness. Since the Father's love determines all the relations of men to one another and all the works that men do together, the religion of Jesus is altogether ethical and its ethic is absolutely religious. The divine purpose is to bring back the life of every man and of all men into the personal social accomplishments of the Father's will.

The fatherhood which holds the child fast seeks no less intensely the lost child until it is found. To men in the utmost depths of sin and its misery are directed all the resources of the Father's redemptive power. To the vilest hell which men can make for themselves, through whatever ages of their persistence there, the summons is given to return, and every divine resource is expended to bring them back. The voice that calls must be heard, because the attempt to separate oneself from the Father and humanity must ever contend against the Godward and manward impulse inseparable from the soul, and hell is itself the misery of resistance to the divine love. There are indeed sayings attributed to Jesus which set a time limit to the redemptive purpose, as if in Jesus' thought it were the will of the Father to annihilate his own fatherhood. The limit in such passages is not the moment of death: so that literalism has no warrant even from them to deny the pos-

sibility of repentance and forgiveness after death. The limit in these passages is the second coming,—an unauthentic apocalyptic intrusion.

The only limitation is in the childhood which cannot be coerced, since its salvation is that it "receives." A salvation that is not a receiving would be a gift unworthy of fatherhood because destructive of childhood. And the soul builds its own universe in the sense that all things are to the soul what its attitude makes them. Yet the eternal hope embraces every soul.

To one who holds Jesus' religion of the Father's will it is morally and spiritually impossible to suppose that this will is not to be accomplished. The logical possibility of failure involved in the incommensurable factor, the human will, is overwhelmed by invincible realities, the power of good to conquer evil, the love of God determined to accomplish its aim. And if one soul is eternally lost, or is annihilated, or loses its essential as soul, there would be the failure of the fatherhood which infinitely loves every child, failure of the family of God forever incomplete, failure in the life of each redeemed child who ultimately requires every other for the fulness of his own personal social being. The resistances, which are themselves resisted by the soul's essential nature and fundamental impulse, encounter the inexhaustible resources of loving fatherhood, and it belongs to the nature of the unfolding spiritual universe that these are disclosed in continual increase of spiritual power. Ignorances, insensibilities, incompletenesses, spiritually repressive conditions, it is the evolutionary purpose of the Father to overcome. When one believes with Jesus that the supreme, all-inclusive power is fatherhood working everywhere and always for the redemption of its children, faith in the Father is faith in his complete success. We, working with the will of the Father, learn with every redemptive task more of the power of the divine fatherhood,

and look for the solution of all mysteries in its consummate achievement.

Jesus declared the gospel of the forgiveness of sins. The nature of that forgiveness is determined by fatherhood. It is not a question of remission of penalty. It is not a Pauline problem of justification which assumed a forensic relation alien to the relation of fatherhood and sonship. Such conceptions are not in Jesus' spiritual universe. Forgiveness means, the Father taking the child back as a child for all that fatherhood can impart and childhood receive. We trust God not to spare us anything that will bring us back. And when we return: This my son was dead and is alive again; he was lost and is found. What more is there for God to say!

IV

The claim of Jesus' religion encounters another, noble and alluring. It is that all faiths including Christianity are to be blended into a universal religion. This ideal, if it is to have any attraction for sane minds, does not mean a superficial syncretism, characteristic of degenerate periods, which sticks together conceptions from various religions, without a unifying principle. Very different is the endeavour to bring into one all the impulses, longings, strivings of humanity in its search for God.

Some of the great religions are concerned predominantly with the divine will. They seek the divine aim rather than the divine nature. Jesus' religion of the Father's will completes them. Its devotion finds God as consummately the Father. This is not a speculative conception. The religion of Jesus corrects all lower apprehensions of the divine will, yet ever drawing from them heroic devotions, magnificent inspirations, and wise directions for the conduct of life according to the will of God.

The religions of the other of the principal types, in which thought and mystical contemplation are prominent, offer to Christianity, in the sense of the religion of Jesus, wealth that its disciples gratefully receive. The same motive which appropriates the spiritual contributions of Jesus' forerunners and followers asks for the thoughts and experiences of all to whom life has been more than a derivation from the physical. Not in one spiritual experience, not even in the experience of Jesus, can all the variety of spiritual experience be contained. The religion of Jesus is a developing vitality. Ever confronted by new tasks of accomplishing the Father's will, it welcomes every light which clarifies the advances of the task. It recognizes that the seeking of God by any impulse of the spirit involves the seeking and culminates in the finding of the Father's will. To its own supreme principle it leads them. Here is the unity of religion in the richest inclusiveness. It estimates spiritual religions of other names not from their inheritances and infections of cruder religious gropings, nor from their degenerations, even as Christianity must not be judged from the superstitions, secularly constructed institutions and dogmatic formulations, which pervert it.

The unspeculative quality of Jesus' religion leaves free the thought and contemplation of other religions of the spirit. It welcomes from them all the deepenings and clarifyings which they contribute to its aim. He came not to condemn the world by repudiating the world's searchings after God, but to save the world by directing them to the aim implicit in them. Abhorrent to him is the denial of salvation to those who have not attained his religious consciousness. Utterly false to him is the test of salvation by a sacramental sign which he never imposed, membership in an institution which he did not contemplate, submission to a creed which formalizes his vital faith.

Thus Christianity's consummation of other religions does not at all involve the claim to possess all their values. It is able to receive all their values. The Christianity of Jesus offers the aim by which all spiritual attainments may be directed, wherever and however originated. Its attitude toward all spiritual searchings is the same as that which it takes to those which are included in the religions of the world. When this aim is revealed, which as aim is always progressive, it stimulates spiritual thought and life from every source. The great religions and the religious attainments outside of them do not shrink before his Christianity, but become immeasurably greater. In all that they have achieved there is then disclosed a finer worth, a more compelling power. New religious discoveries, new beneficent spiritual forces are confidently hoped for, since the sufficient aim, which is Jesus' religion of the Father's will, unseals all springs of spiritual life and power.

CHAPTER X

JESUS' REALIZATION OF THE FATHER'S WILL

I

Among the important spiritual developments of our time is a deep Christian sentiment which spontaneously and independently accords with the constructive criticism of the synoptic gospels, while it intuitively receives the fourth gospel as a spiritual interpretation. This sentiment excludes from its interest much of that which criticism eliminates, and emphasizes that which criticism retains. Both movements are progressive, consequently incomplete. Therefore in some respects and phases there have been divergencies between them. But their alliance with one another grows steadily.

The increase of harmony is not won through any concession on the part of New Testament science. Its work would be futile if subject to any external influence. The agreement is because the vital realities are taken by earnest discipleship: the unreal is left. Constructive criticism releases this Christian devotion from remainders of encumbrances and perplexities, that it may more clearly distinguish the supreme powers by which the aims of Jesus were accomplished.

When one reads the records of Jesus' ministry thoughtfully without the aid of historic investigation, one has to make apologetic allowances for some of the representations of him. He does not then appear altogether the leader who can be followed without a reservation. No fair-minded man can help being troubled by the tone and content of those indiscriminate invectives against the

religious leaders of his people, with some of whom he was intimate, so that one of his fiercest diatribes is reported to have been uttered by him as a guest against his host and fellow guests. The difficulty increases when we learn how much of genuine spirituality was in the Judaism of his day and among its leaders. The consignment of some opponents to eternal perdition without the possibility of forgiveness is not in the spirit by which we would be guided. An influence upon the record from the early church's aloofness from secular affairs makes a strange discord with his broad human interests. A prescriptive conception of Israel's law does not comport with his spiritual freedom. The fourth gospel's reiterations of a personal claim are great and beautiful when they are not regarded as his own sayings but as later expressions of the faith which he created. One is troubled by the failure of his faith in the cry, "Why hast thou forsaken me!" An explanation is possible but it is not helpful that an explanation has to be surmised. We read the predictions of the thirteenth chapter of Mark and its parallels and wish that he had not spoken those inaccuracies. The expectation ascribed to Jesus of the speedy coming of the Son of Man appears to be not only an error of judgment, a limitation of thought, but also a spiritual defect. For its implications concerning God, humanity and Jesus himself, the more they are pondered separate us the more from the God, humanity and Christ demanded by our faith. The Christ who multiplied the loaves and walked upon the lake, and whose birth left him only part human, is a spiritual foreigner, nor can we connect his miraculous endowments with the work he left us to do without those resources. From such representations we turn to passages more congenial, and to their Christ. Yet the disharmonies remain like rough chords accompanying a perfect melody. They suggest perplexities of our thought,

hesitancies of endeavour, uncertainties of aim. They confuse our presentation of Jesus to a world which requires a self-consistent Christ. When these incongruities are removed, not by fumbling excuses, nor by any concession in fearless research, then there is the clarifying and energizing of devoted discipleship.

Then the faithful student of Jesus' life finds that no allowance or apology has to be made for him. He was sufficient for his historic mission and is sufficient for the leadership of humanity. Not one authentic exception to his adequacy can be found in his ministry. Therefore none can be found in his leadership, for the two are one. Any efficiency outside that sufficiency is superfluous. The attainments of mankind from industrial to cultural he left for civilization to win. His task was to discover the spiritual aims by which they are completed. To receive these aims from the will of the Father was his incomparable religious genius. He possessed intellect and artistry for clear perception and beautiful presentation. He was a child of his own age and people, and addressed himself to the tasks then urgent, that from the work next his hand might radiate to all the world and all the ages the universal which was there expressed. Certain limitations which he shared with his age and people he so interpreted that they did not impede nor limit his work. The current demonology meant to him the power of God to expel the power of evil from the human soul. What was to him the course of the circling sun around the fixed and central earth was also the revelation of the beauty, power, majesty and beneficence of the Father. He did not know, as we know, the mechanism of nature. We do not know, as he knew, the spiritual purpose which is in it all. Ignorant of our science he grasped its ultimate, the divine order in all things. The limits of his physical universe he overcame in his adoration of the divine illimitableness.

How the sufficiency could be, for the historic mission and eternal leadership of Jesus, is beyond our searching. We can only say that his genius was altogether religious. This means that he was continually receptive of the thought and heart and aim of God.

The question of the sinlessness of Jesus suggests itself here. The ineptitude of a negative formulation of his character is obvious: his goodness was positive. To one who has known a stainless soul formed by Christ in the positive goodness which implies the victories of moral conflicts, with continual unfolding of ethical ideals, the ascription to Christ of unalloyed holiness is inevitable. He is not less than that which he has made. Of such a creation we speak in deepest reverence when we pronounce it Christlike. The moral ideal of such a soul is not abstract virtue or virtues, but the Christ, source of its Christlikeness. While it draws its moral beauty from all things that are beautiful and excellent, it centres and consummates them all in its personal ideal, Christ. Such a soul is conscious of its source and goal. Christ's influence upon those who knew him in his earthly life, upon those who after his death confessed him as their Master and Lord, and upon his disciples of every age, is an influence undimmed by any touch of sin.

Our inevitable estimate of his character, with which all our knowledge of him agrees, is reinforced by his own testimony. It is not indeed a declaration of his own moral perfectness. The perfectly pure soul cannot assert its own moral excellence, for its moral consciousness is not of itself but of that absolute divine goodness which is above all moral conflict. "Why callest thou me good? One is good, God." But his complete ethical humanity is implied in his consciousness of being the son of the Father, representative and impartive of that sonship. The great words, "No man knoweth the Father save the son and he to

whom the son wills to reveal him," are from the most reliable source used by our evangelists. But they lose nothing of their convincing power even if not literally authentic, since they express his essential consciousness and its effect upon those who for this reason believed in him. What is contained in that saying is interpretative of his relation to the Father. It is determinative of his mission. It constitutes his very being. When we reflect upon what childhood meant to him and sonship as the continuance and perfecting of childhood, in its revelation of the Father, in its union with God in redemptive aim, we have a revelation of Jesus' character which excludes everything that is not of its own essential nature.

II

Though we may not have a single authentic incident of Jesus' life until just before the beginning of his ministry, for Luke's beautiful story of the boy Jesus in the temple is more gracefully turned than reality is wont to be, yet conditions of his childhood are clear to us through his assimilation of them. The religion of Israel penetrated his closest environment, in home, synagogue, and indeed throughout that Jewish life whose aim was to order all personal and social affairs according to the will of God. The gospel legends of his infancy and Luke's story of the boy are full of exquisite expressions of that influence. In the evangelists' account of his ministry the meagre reference to the surroundings and employment of his earlier years are confirmatory. Based upon that genuinely Jewish life, filled with it, is every authentic word and deed of his. We know the form of it, which was Israel's law. We know its prescriptive limitations which he had to transcend and its spiritual essential which it was his task to fulfil. We know the hope of Israel and what aspect of that hope was dominant.

We are fortunate also in our considerable knowledge of the secular life which surrounded him. Even if we had no other source of information than the vivid pictures of his parables, of city, town and country, these are sufficient to reproduce it. The incomparable delineations are by one who from his early childhood observed closely with discriminative sympathy. Favourable to his acquaintance with men and affairs was the situation of Nazareth where he had been brought up. Close to it was one of the most thriving towns of Galilee, so close that Nazareth was all but a part of it; for this reason, very likely, unmentioned in ancient Jewish literature. The principal city of Galilee, Sepphoris, was only three miles away. Destroyed in Jesus' childhood, it was rebuilt and enlarged during his boyhood and young manhood. He saw the varied life, Gentile and Jewish, of a growing city which ranked in the Holy Land next to Jerusalem. All around was a vigorous agriculture. Beautiful are the hills and flowers of Galilee, especially beautiful in the vicinity of Nazareth. It was a region of extensive outlooks, southward across the historic plain of Esdrælon, with the Samaritan hills beyond, northward to the great mountains.

Favourable to the boy's experience of life was his father's trade which was also his. Builder is a more appropriate designation than carpenter. The prosperity of this vocation was stimulated by the restoration and growth of neighbouring Sepphoris. This growth necessarily extended into the adjoining towns. The degree of his father's success in his occupation, and the resultant economics of his home are matters of conjecture. He might have been a hired workman. He might have been an employer and contractor. If we estimate the father by the abilities of his son, he was not incompetent to achieve a respectable measure of success under the favourable conditions. We have no reasons to assign to Jesus a childhood of repressive

poverty. We may infer from his accomplished manners, his mastery of every social exigency who was at home with all sorts and conditions of men, from his wide and intimate knowledge of practical affairs, that he belonged to the class which furnishes a large proportion of the greatest and finest when there is not an artificial repression. They are neither spoiled by luxury nor crushed by want. Sympathetic acquaintance with life in varied phases, efficiency and versatility are open to them. They do able work in the fear of God, and are receptive of fine, strong things. To their children they give training and opportunity, and bequeath to them powers of mind and character which may be sufficient for the world's greatest tasks.

As a Jewish boy he was given some education at home, some at school, attended the instructive services of the synagogue, and received the illuminations and inspirations of journeys to the feasts at Jerusalem. His training was predominantly religious but involved rudiments of secular knowledge. We know what extensive educational advantages were available in a later phase of Jewish life to an intellectually ambitious youth, even though intending a secular career. Even in Jesus' day a boy of a place situated as was Nazareth could make for himself opportunities of learning what he most longed to know. We cannot think of him as less earnest and enterprising in this respect than other great minds in their formative years. His supreme task found him intellectually equipped for it, and his adequacy as teacher was recognized.

Most important in influence was Jesus' family. It was a family from which his ministry could grow. There were several children. "Of such is the kingdom of God" is said most significantly when the child's filial relation is fulfilled in brotherhood or sisterhood. The quality of the other children is indicated in the prominent discipleship

of "the brothers of the Lord," who had played with him in Nazareth. Though there is no real evidence of royal descent, the leadership in the church of Jerusalem of three relatives of Jesus in succession suggests a superior strain. It would be unjust to his mother to base an estimate of her upon an unfortunate occurrence, his family's attempt to withdraw him from his ministry. The report may misrepresent her personal attitude. It is better to think of the mother of earth's greatest man as one who could represent womanhood and motherhood in Luke's legend of the nativity and in the world's adoration of the mother and child. We know that Jesus' manliness was not deficient in womanliness. The nature of his work, physically and socially impossible for a woman in that age, demanded complete receptiveness to the womanly. The essential meaning of the Catholic worship of the virgin mother is in the Christ who absorbed womanhood and motherhood into his leadership of the world.

Jesus' references to fatherhood always imply motherhood. None the less does Jesus' ministry witness to the deep influence upon him of his father Joseph. From him he learned the meaning of the divinest word. He led the child's mind and heart into the fatherhood of God. Incomparable are Jesus' thoughts of home life under a father's care, and his penetration of the depths of a father's soul. The great words of Jesus that reveal the Father drew power and tenderness from the memory of his human father.

There was an experience which opened to a child's retentiveness the infernal aspect of humanity, the sin and misery of the world. In his childhood raged Judas' revolt against Rome, in which the neighbouring city of Sepphoris was prominent, and the unimaginable woes of the suppression of the rebellion, culminating in the destruction of Sepphoris. Even if Nazareth were not then his home, or

if parental care removed him or shielded him from the spectacle of men crucified along the roads of Galilee, the results were around him for him to feel, the ineffaceable memories for him to share. He knew what crucifixion meant. There were revealed to the boy human passions at their worst. There were awakened in him compassions without limit, the longing to redeem men out of degredations and miseries and hates, to the kingdom where God's will is accomplished in righteousness and peace, in love and blessedness.

If we have permitted conjectures to colour our picture, they are laid upon distinct lines of the child's formation of the man. It is indeed true that the secret depth of any soul, its unfoldings of inheritances and environment by powers untraceable, in men of genius most mysterious, are known only to the all-searching wisdom, the all-penetrative sympathy. Of Jesus whose soul was an immeasurable spiritual universe it is consummately true that none knoweth the son save the Father. But the moulding of oneself, which in one who has really achieved humanity is by life's aim, is in large part from that which we may call the materials of life, and which are in childhood most formative. In Jesus' childhood we hear God saying: I will create the supreme lover of myself and men, and I will give him the fundamental understanding of the humanity which I will save through him.

In no other place and in no other time could the materials of Jesus' life have been provided better than in that unspoiled home which concentrated and vitalized Israel's best, and in that town and city and country which made familiar to him the physical, social and spiritual needs of men. For one whose task is in the developments of civilization other influences are requisite. He whose mission was to find the aims by which civilization must direct itself that it may fulfil itself is the man of Nazareth.

III

Our study of the aim of Jesus has been a study of his personality. A few reflections may be added.

Jesus impresses us as a distinct, vivid individuality. Yet attempts to interpret him from one dominant trait or group of traits have won no success. With whatever excellence is selected, one of a different aspect appears in equal power. His prophetic indignation, all the intenser for its self-mastery, is matched by his ineffable tenderness. His moral idealism commanded men to acknowledge no lower standard of conduct than the Father's perfectness; and to Jesus, understanding all and forgiving all, human infirmities were pitiful, of men distressed and scattered like sheep without a shepherd. A solitude of soul was his upon which we, with the companions of his ministry, presume not to intrude; and he was of all men the social man. Altogether sophisticated in the sense that no pretence could deceive him—we have seen that Judas' betrayal is a creation of legend—shrewd to the ultimate of Jewish shrewdness, he kept his own noble simplicity and his faith in men. Recognizing him as the Jew, we have found his Judaism to be the universally human. He was child of his own time that he might lead the ages. He sacrificed and he enjoyed. He came eating and drinking on his way to the cross. Sense of reality and sensitiveness to every shade of beauty, both were his, with concentration upon things eternal and openness to every impression of nature and human life; strength and delicacy, meekness and dignity, gravity and mirth, strength and self-reliance. Each quality is called into prominence as the occasion demands, but always the other qualities are so present that we feel in every situation the completeness of him. Jesus was the most individual of men in this uniqueness, that in him all normal qualities were integrated. He did not have the

defects of any of them. Therefore among all impressions of personality his is the most distinct and powerful. Psychoanalysis in its studies of Jesus finds no abnormality in his depths. This method is valuable in tracing his sublimations of natural qualities, as in his fatherliness who took little children up in his arms and blessed them. From those sublimations in Jesus a celestial light is shed upon our physical organization. Everything natural to man, every inheritance from beneath, all that belongs to flesh and sense, normally fulfils itself as material of Christlikeness.

The biologist wonders whether the process of evolution which has climbed up to man is finished there, whether there may not emerge in the far future a being who shall be to man what man is to the hominids, and further ascents beyond our imagination. To this question Jesus gives the threefold answer: man is the son of God, and there is nothing under God higher than this sonship in any world and in any phase; this sonship has illimitable evolutions; human developments must be under the leadership of spiritual powers. We may hope that the body of man may be disencumbered from outgrown vestiges of lower forms; that the human brain, now functioning even at its best to a small fraction of its capability, may realize its potential energies; that hidden springs of power may be progressively discovered for conquest of the physical universe to be man's instrument. Yet for attainments of real worth these and any greater sovereignties must be directed by the aim which Jesus realized. Along the ascent he is the leader, he is the way.

Jesus' harmonious inclusion of all normal human qualities is not a denial of the purely religious character of his genius. The religious realm, the life of the spirit, can concede nothing to any lower claim. It has its own inexpressible receptions of the Father's wisdom and power and holi-

ness and love, of peace which the world cannot give nor take away, of blessedness which affirms its own eternal being, for it is the blessedness of the eternal Father. Yet if made a separate realm it is annulled. For its reality is its consummation of joys, toils, sufferings, loves and of the divine which is immanent in them. If these are eliminated every content of the life of the spirit vanishes. The spiritual has then become the utter emptiness, from which no good nor power can flow into the lives of men. But the life of the spirit, far from limiting men's common life, witnesses to its implicit values, and Jesus is the supreme witness. To turn from the world to what is distinctively termed the religious life is to repudiate his gospel. The life of the spirit, because the consummation of all human life is also its power. Into everything human the spirit must be poured in his perfect way.

IV

What place has Jesus himself in his religion of the Father's will? What faith in Jesus is contained in the faith in the Father which he taught and lived? The answer given in the most notable creeds and in the theologies that have defended them is as remote from modern thought as the pagan gnosticism and arianism which they suppressed,—to the world's eternal gratitude. A more important consideration is that the credal answer has always been inexpressive both of the real Jesus and of faith in him. The speculations of Nicæa and Chalcedon have no vital connection with the faith of vast multitudes who have believed and loved and followed Jesus. And what would he have answered who said, "Why callest thou me good! One is good, God," if any one had addressed him as very God? There must be a simpler understanding of the fact that Jesus and his religion have always

been inseparable, except for some attempts which, proving futile, have testified to the inseparableness.

A deeper answer begins with something very simple and familiar. It is, that moral and spiritual truths, principles and ideals have power in the world when they are realized in persons. The reason is not that these values are in themselves too high for the common mind, and must be "embodied in a tale" to "enter in at lowly doors." If that were the reason, superior minds could dispense with Jesus, and the teachings just as teachings would be all that is required of him. Then as the world gained wisdom the memory of Jesus might fade out of its heart. The reason is that those realities by which men live are not abstract but vital. So the great soul receives them, not from a realm of conceptions but from the living God, both directly and through such a human mediation as connects him with God in whom and from whom they are. As living realities he imparts them that other men may become participants in his experience of the life of God in man. No other personal realizations of Jesus' ideals are comparable to the vitality which they have in him. Their realizations in others direct us to him in whom is their completeness.

The Jesus in whom we believe, believing in the Father, is the purely human Jesus, unless we prefer to his self-consciousness our own different interpretation of him. Not all who have made this unqualified affirmation of his humanity have discerned that it involves a deeper faith in him than that of the creeds.

The pure humanity of Jesus is learned not only from such words of his as have been quoted, but especially from his dependence upon the Father, which was that of the human child. Into his own prayer and trust and love and devotion he bids us follow him. His mission, with his endowment for it, was to him the highest human task.

The consummated human consciousness was his Christ-consciousness.

The completely human Jesus is the revelation of humanity in every man and in the united life and work of men. Beneath the differences of condition, vocation, endowment, in any phase of civilization and savagery, the essential of every man is that which Jesus is in his sonship to the Father. In him is the fundamental unity of all men. To come to Jesus is to come to oneself and to every brother man. Jesus is the leader of humanity because the essential of him is potential in every man. In that reality of humanity which he is, all its forces and tasks must be developed. His sonship to the Father is humanity's nature and goal. He is the revelation of the human because he is its impartive power.

He lived long ago. Yet he is known and felt in many ways: in the records of his life, when he is recognized beneath their imperfections; in his continuous power upon the world, far beyond conscious acceptance of his leadership; in Christlike lives of his creation. Into art, into thought, into household affection, into the finer sentiments, the devoted services, he enters. What a hardened and impoverished world it would be if Christ were taken out of it! Whether a man counts himself his disciple or not, let him imagine if he can, the pitifulness that would be left to him if what he owes to Christ were gone. All these witnesses of him are impartations of his personality. They bring to us not abstract truths, principles, ideals, as separate from him, but himself. For there is no loss of the immediate power of a holy, loving soul, when the mortal face is seen no more. Then an obscuration is removed. There is a closer, clearer touch of soul, conditioned only by the faithfulness of our deepened faith and love. Jesus is the ever-living Christ, imparting his life to men.

Is there in him a personal response to our love and gratitude, to the attraction of our souls to him? In the personal social realm of the spirit receptiveness implies impartation which is responsive. This responsiveness belongs to all great, holy, loving souls. Even in the limitations of this mortal phase the ways are many and wonderful of these communings. The desire of every such nobility is that all barriers to its own responses shall be done away. Jesus asked, "Who touched me?" It were a limitation of the Father's love and power to doubt the fulfilment of that prophetic desire.

The completely human Christ is essential to his gospel of the Father's will, because the human is the revelation of the Father. We have seen the Father in faces illumined by the divine beauty. We have heard him in voices that spoke his thought. We have felt his touch in the tenderness and strong helpfulness of human hands. The eyes of holy love have been the penetrating light of his judgment, their sweet forgiveness his redemption. The human guidance is the Father's guidance. The universe, from flower to star, has declared to us the divine glory when the insight of the seer has created our vision of the divine fatherhood, Lord of heaven and earth. By human guides God has led us into our own inmost sanctuaries and into the ways and powers of his service. What else do we need in Christ than the complete human, to be to us the face of God?

If this seems a disparagement of Christ as but one revelation of God among others, the answer is his essential completeness as realization of the Father's will. It is in this consummate sense that it can be said, "No one knoweth the Father save the son and he to whom the son wills to reveal him." Whenever in any age men who have not known Jesus have been revelations of the divine which was present in them, the revelations are searchings

for the larger light that is in him. The divine manifestations of Christian lives are Christ in them. He is no less the Christ because he fulfils and imparts.

That which can be revealed of God, that which God is, need not be conceived, in this age of the world's thinking, as "substance," somehow to be distinguished from the living unity of God's thoughts, loves, effective purposes, so that the revealer of God must somehow possess that "substance." To think God's thoughts, to live God's love, in devotion to God's aim, is to be the revealer of God.

The supreme meaning of the humanity of Christ is the humanity of God. The old creeds proceeded from the assumption of a radical separation between what God is and what man is. Jesus' revelation is of the Father of whose nature the children are. There are mysteries of the divine that are unfathomable. But out of them appears the God who is our God. Jesus' revelation of the Father is of the highest human qualities perfected in love, in their lordship of heaven and earth. The Father is not alien, is not remote, is not separate from his children. In the pure humanity of Jesus the union of God and man, of Father and child, is realized.

In the acceptance of Jesus as the human revelation of the Father "the faith of Jesus" and "faith in Jesus" are one. There are not two Christianities, the one theocentric and the other Christocentric. There are not two religions in the New Testament, though some conceptions of Christ in the New Testament are not derived from him. When these are eliminated from our acceptance of what the Pauline and Johannean writings tell us of him, then in their faith which deepens ours there shines the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

Because Christianity has been formed largely from Paul at his worst is no reason for rejecting Paul at his best,—in his recognition of the consummate triumph of

the cross, his estimate of Christ's eternal significance as leader of every soul, revelation of the Father, opener of the spiritual universe. The forms in which he expressed this insight were affected by influences Pharisaic, apocalyptic, Hellenistic, temperamental. All such things are the outer shell of Paul's faith in his Saviour. It belongs to a true apprehension of the man to distinguish these from his vision of the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

In the fourth gospel, which is not to be ascribed to the apostle John, Paul's light from the crucified and risen Christ illumines his earthly ministry. In this experience and interpretation of Jesus, the essentials are not the quasi-metaphysical attempts to construct Christ's nature, nor the colossal symbolic miracles, nor the details of repetitious debates. The forms of the Johannean faith were determined in large part by their oppositions to perversions of Christianity and attacks upon it, which were important then but have to us only an historic interest. It is significant that in this deep experience of Christ the apocalyptic interpretation of him has become remote, unessential and negligible. Great utterances ascribed to Christ are so expressive of life in him that their origin is essentially the Christ in whom the author of the fourth gospel lived, and who lived in this inspired disciple. This gospel is the culmination of the early experiences of revelations and inspirations from the Lord. The influence of a companion of Jesus, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," is a field of interesting conjecture. Its significance is a real connection of this writing with Jesus' ministry and the course of its deepening interpretations. The earlier gospels are read aright in the light of the fourth gospel and of the great epistle also attributed to the apostle John. The ministry of Jesus is rightly interpreted by the profound word, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

In our vital acceptance of evangelical Christianity is its reconciliation both with liberal Christianity and with progressive Judaism. The first of these involves union with the world's spiritual thought and aspiration. Progressive Judaism is finding in Jesus of Nazareth the consummation of its faith. Jews may, in the words of one of their most devoted representatives, "recover their lost leader." To find this consummation in a personal realization is to find their own Judaism in its deepest meaning, in its power to organize all human works and relations by the Father's will. Paul's great longing may have a more vital fulfilment than he anticipated, when Jew and Christian are one in the divinely human leadership of Jesus.

V

In any difficult problem of action, thought or soul, there is some element which leads on to the solution. As Jesus' blessing of little children discloses what God is and what men are to God and to one another, so the essential significance of the cross meets us in Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane.

In Mark's report of it, upon which the other two evangelists depend, there is a verisimilitude that compels credence, in contrast to his accounts of the trial and crucifixion, where invention was not checked by apostolic testimony. Here on the contrary, as in his narrative of Peter's denial, his best source is evident, which there is every reason to believe was the leader of the apostles. Only two simplifications are necessary. In Jesus' prayer as Mark gives it the Greek word for Father is obviously the evangelist's translation of the Aramaic word Abba. It is also to be noted that the phrase "saying the same words," may be an intrusion from Matthew into early manuscripts.

The simplicity and naturalness of Mark's account is obscured by the other evangelists. In Luke's story Jesus goes on from the disciples "about a stone's cast" before he begins to utter his prayer. Mark tells us that the prayer was said "a little" distance from the disciples, where his words could be heard. According to Matthew, the three disciples, though overcome with sleep, hear Jesus pray three times, the second and third prayers identical but differing from the first. In Mark one prayer is reported, spoken before sleep invaded the three disciples. In the other evangelists the words of prayer are smoothed out into logical form. In Mark they are broken words from a breaking heart: "Father, all things are possible to thee: take this cup away from me: but not what I will but what thou."

The significance of Gethsemane for the interpretation of the cross is that there Jesus won his supreme victory, perfected his realization of the Father's will. The soul's great battles are first fought within the soul. Pain and disaster and death are endured victoriously when before the event one has looked them in the face, has made complete estimate of their forces, has gathered energies from the inner depths and from the spiritual allies that pour into those depths. Even when the test comes suddenly, the true manhood, which has ever the clear vision of realities, both those which oppose and those which empower, is not unprepared; but whenever opportunity can be gained he chooses to anticipate the test, that it may at every point be manfully endured. This attitude is the opposite of weakening imaginations and forebodings. When the event arrives, when the test comes that seems unendurable to those who watch, as before the cross, they need have no apprehension of the outcome. The victory has been won already on the spiritual battle-ground, even as Calvary was conquered at Gethsemane.

Jesus' death as interpreted by his prayer in Gethsemane is his realization of the Father's will. That will he realized in his complete devotion: "Not what I will but what thou." The meaning of the cross is in his prayer. From our thought and life how many futile speculations fall away! "Who talks of scheme and plan" in Gethsemane? These perverse interpretations have obscured the power of the cross. When they are removed there are presented spiritual majesty and redemptive power immeasurable. No man may presume to estimate them. But we may reverently express some of the echoes of his words in our own souls, some reflections in human life of humanity's supreme accomplishment, complete consecration.

We recognize that his death was required by simple faithfulness to his mission. His work led him into extreme peril from implacable enemies. He accepted the risk and therefore the issue. Thus his cross interprets his whole life, both during his mission and in all the years that were its preparation. To do the Father's will whatever the task may involve was the essential of Jesus' life. To do the Father's will whatever the task may involve is the life of discipleship, which takes up the cross daily and follows him. To make the will of the Father supreme in the life of humanity against whatever oppositions and pains the world inflicts upon its saviours is the fulfilment of his cross.

Yet there is absent from Jesus' prayer any trace of that morbid preference for pain which has so often disfigured and denaturalized the religious life. It is the expression of the normal humanity which is attuned to joy. It is the utterance of one who always received with a child's receptiveness the good and pleasant things which the Father gave, in which the Father's love was the value and blessedness, and whose passion was to impart these gifts to others that all men might be God's happy children. The tran-

scendent happiness of sonship and brotherhood entreats that the cup of pain may be taken away. Any lack of this natural and religious love of unselfish joy, which involves sensitiveness to sorrow, diminishes the experience and significance of any cross. The soul most appreciative of the Father's gifts can most devotedly offer Christ's prayer.

We receive from that prayer the supreme victory of the human soul. There is nothing which the soul may not overcome in devotion to the Father's will. Whatever can assail man with the fearful weapon, pain, was encountered and conquered. It was victory over the extreme agony of flesh and spirit. When we look outward and inward upon a world of suffering it must be said, "Behold and see if there be any sorrow like his sorrow!" He would not be defeated though exceeding sorrowful even unto death. He who knew what was in the cup, who was capable of feeling most intensely, whose every impulse cried out that it might be taken away from him, also prayed, "But not what I will but what thou." The soul's pre-eminence is won in devotion to the Father's will. It is won by prayer, whose answer is the will of the Father becoming the will of the child.

Far inferior to Jesus' prayer is the interpretation of an early Christian writing, "Who for the joy set before him endured the cross, despising shame." Of a higher religious consciousness is the ancient confession, "Though he slay me yet will I trust him." In the ultimate conflicts more is required than the motive of one's own blessedness here or hereafter. It must be that to which the soul can give itself in complete devotion. Nor is it necessary to look beyond the acceptance of the Father's will. The conflict may be too fierce for that, the darkness impenetrable. To pray, "Father not what I will but what thou,"—is all.

There is no depreciation of Jesus' prayer when we see

that it conquers a lower religious consciousness by a higher. The lower is the appeal to God to whom all things are conceived to be possible. In this realm of faith, which is not to be denied but transcended, are the doubts based upon the questioning either of God's inability or unwillingness to exclude pain and evil from his world, the entreaties that they may not enter our lives. We rise from that into the recognition of a will which includes what is beyond our power to trace, but which we can accept as the will of the all-holy, all-loving fatherhood which is Lord of heaven and earth. To attain that higher realm of utter devotion is the complete victory, which is God's victory in the human soul.

That which is sufficient unto the uttermost is sufficient for every detail of life's task and battle. The power competent to the supreme demand is competent for everything included in it, which is to be subdued to the accomplishment of the Father's will; in daily works and plays, in family and friendship, in all human relations and organizations, in every direction of the means of life to the ends of life.

In this prayer is victory over whatever might destroy, diminish or thwart the soul. Every evil is surmounted. All things are under the feet of the conqueror. The victory is over death, for it is the vindication of the spirit's supremacy. The principle is realized, "He that loseth his life shall save it." It is the victory present and eternal of all who believe in him, with the faith that receives, as a little child receives, his invincible prayer into the energies of the soul. The fulfilment of the promise is inevitable, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame and sat down with my Father on his throne." It is the victory of humanity over the immense antagonist, the physical universe which can daunt it no longer; over flesh and sense subdued to be

instruments of soul; over the enemies within; over everything that resists the accomplishment of the Father's will in all the life of men. The supreme sacrifice enfolds the eternal blessedness. Heaven's prayer is, "Not what I will but what thou."

In all thought upon the cross there is present its relation to human sin. For the sins of men brought Jesus to the cross, inflicted upon him the supreme agonies. Sin is most self-condemned not by its effects upon the guilty but by its perpetrations upon the innocent. It inflicts a misery of a different quality than that which can proceed from the disasters of another origin. It adds its own woe to its instruments of pain. It violates the love of God: this was the bitterness of the cup which might not be taken away from him. When sin is against the most holy and most loving, unwearying in ministry and compassion, in whom is the love of the Father, then the sin of the world and the moral defects of every man are summoned before the cross, which is the judgment-seat of Christ.

The cross of Christ is no less majestic because it does not stand alone. It would not gain any glory of the victory of the soul in devotion to the Father's will, of conviction of sin, of redeeming power, if it excluded from itself other realizations of holiness and love. These are interpreted and consummated by his devotion, which summons every man to realize it in his own soul and service.

God gives himself in the answer to prayer. Nothing less than the imparting of God's will was sufficient for Christ's victory, and God's will means all of God directed by his own redemptive aim. The divine helper is not as one who stands apart, giving something external to himself for conflicts which he does not share. It has been said that when we gaze up among the stars we may see arms extended and hands pierced. We need not look so far away. The heart of fatherhood is one with the heart

of the child. Christ in the Father and the Father in him suffered and overcame. And the Father is not less participant in every accomplishment of his will.

The victory of Gethsemane is victory that saves. Whenever one suffers in love for him who has sinned, there is power of redemption; as in a mother's sorrows for the sins of her children, as in the sufferings accepted by every prophet, hero, martyr, lover of mankind. Here is a mystery beneath the mystery of pain. No word is sufficient to express it. There is no explanation of it, no theory for it. It is the Father's will, it is the love of God. To know that all suffering may be made sacrificial, and that sacrificial suffering is redemption limitless, life's ultimate meaning, the secret of the spiritual universe, the heart of the Father flaming forth in the cross of Christ, this is to feel the power and victory of the cross whose meanings continually unfolding are forever inexhaustible.

With the cross the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord comes to every lost soul in every lost world. Nothing can overcome it. Nothing can stop it. There is no work too hard for it, no pain too great for it to bear, that it may save to the uttermost. This is Jesus' religion and realization of the Father's will.

In the power of Jesus' victory the beloved community, of every creed and of no creed (yet they are all, consciously or unconsciously or with a dawning consciousness, in the discipleship of Jesus) continues his task, in his devotion, of directing all that men do and live together to that for which he lived and died.

CHAPTER XI

WORLD AND SOUL

I

The world and the inner life of men are inseparable companions both in their mutual friendships and enmities. When men attempt to eliminate everything subjective from their investigations of our newly discovered physical universe, which is making former conceptions of it as antiquated as ancient mythical cosmologies, and which contradicts our mental constructions, resists our accustomed categories of thought, then no less than before are our experiments and conclusions conditioned by that inner life, which is summoned to more intensive working. The subjective is evident in work most objective. When men would be absorbed in the inner life, concentrating themselves to transcend all else, then the elimination of the world becomes the effacement of the inner life, and for its sake the world must be redemanded. The world is insistent when we try to be most subjective.

Though inseparable the two must be distinguished, with their boundaries continually resurveyed, their relations continually readjusted. When in thought or action, in affairs large or small, men confuse the world with the inner life there is loss of reality. When men confuse the inner life with the world there is loss of value. As reality is of no importance without value and value is empty without reality both confusions reach the same impotent conclusion. The persistent effort to reduce one realm to the other, in materialism or idealism, has no possibility of success except by tracing out each, in its distinctiveness,

to its ultimate. Where the two are most intimate, intertwined, as it were interfused, there the distinction is ethically imperative between body and soul.

However the ultimate distinction, or the ultimate union, is to be realized, and however in anticipation conceived, there is an inevitable difference to each man in his world. To express it completely would involve final knowledge of the world and complete attainment of the inner life. It is experienced whenever one says, I, you, we, always in a world which must be related to oneself and to other men.

In all the inner social life of men there is the inevitable relation to the social world which must yet be distinguished from it. This social world, builded upon the natural world and using its materials, is the world of institutions, industrial, commercial, governmental, cultural, religious. This social world, continuously constructed, is encountered by every inner life in its relations to any other, by the inner life of humanity. Apart from that social world the inner social life of men would have no reality. Apart from the social inner life the social world would have no value.

The word world is generally accepted as the name for that which is distinguished from the inner life of men. For the latter also a single word is more convenient than a phrase. The word soul is, all things considered, the most usable. It is the word of common speech, and here as often the common word is preferable as indicative of a universal consciousness. The scriptural word heart is used in a general ignorance of its scriptural meaning, and from the shallow interpretation floods of sentimentality have poured into Christianity. The word mind is indeed less encumbered with superstititions than the word soul, but its connotations are too predominantly intellectual to express that which is more than intellectual. The word spirit is associated with the nobler potencies and achieve-

ments. The word consciousness is not extensive enough for our psychology; and the word self is too individualistic for the inner unity of men. Common uses of the word person have taken the colour out of it. Personality has not always a concrete meaning. The word soul has closer equivalents in other languages than have the more eligible of the other words mentioned. Mind, spirit, are difficult to render into sister languages of occidental culture. Into these we do not hesitate to translate soul,—as for example, *Seele*, *âme*, *anima*. The word if used as symbolic rather than descriptive, and if we do not extend it into speculations about it, is not inadequate for the distinction, world and soul. The other terms are available for the soul's various aspects and activities.

To relate world and soul throughout their whole range is the task that must not only be thought but done. To this practical endeavour belongs the study of the aims of Jesus, by which the world and the soul are to be related to each other. Unto this is the scholar's search, the critic's toil, practically directed to the world as it now encounters us and to present developments of soul. For the universal practical problem, with attempts at theoretical solutions, faces each age in a new aspect. It is a work for every man in the conditions of his place and time. Though the record of mankind with its insistent problem is largely of disastrous failure, in the Christian era and those which preceded it, in that part of the world which names itself Christendom and in the wide expanses beyond its uncertain and shifting boundaries, yet the task may be hopefully renewed in the light of the aims of Jesus, in the power of his religion and realization of the Father's will.

The attempted solutions of the relation of soul to world, in all their varieties and interfusions, reduce to a few persistent types. Our time's task and that of any man in our

time may be clarified by a review of the most important of them, with special reference to their present forms. These as they shape themselves in contemporary thought and life, more or less consciously, whether expressed or latent, avowed or unconfessed, we compare with Jesus' answer, as our time may realize it, that his answer may become practically clear in the comparison, and that we may find in other conceptions implications of it, also distinguishing that which his aims exclude.

II

The darkest conception is that of soul overwhelmed by the world. The brevity of its mention here is because it can best be considered in another connection, as a problem in the highest conception of the relation of world and soul. This cursory reference is not because its vast extent is not recognized, from the savage's impotent terrors up to the Greek drama, and down to greatly admired literary decadences of our own time. Man is regarded as subject to irresistible forces which fling him, not where they will (for there is nothing so human as will in them, except in puerile fancies) but where he would not. He touches the world and to his confusion releases uncontrollable energies which are destructive of any human worth or power. He makes his social world of constructions and organizations and they escape his control and work upon him as a fate. Every man knows this conception, knows that his yielding to it marks his weakest hours.

Of a different quality may be the subordination of soul to world. This form of construing the relation can be observed the more clearly by first citing the imposing example of an enduring civilization which through the milleniums of its history has governed itself by this principle. The appreciation of the Chinese culture, especially of its

unaging ancient literature, is a large addition to occidental thought and life. It is a civilization which chooses to determine itself by the order of the world. By this, dispassionately observed with calm reflection, it undertakes to regulate not only human affairs but also human consciousness. Beneath the phenomena of the world it seeks the undeviating process and accepts its regnancy into thought and feeling. By this it has dominated not only primitive faith and custom but also receptions from another land, India. To this it subjected those who invaded it. Some of its teachers whom humanity finds attractive, spiritually related to the greatest of the Stoics, discovered in the way of the world spiritual power and aim akin to humanity's noblest aspirations. Yet the dominating influence was not theirs, but has been and is expressed in one, Confucius, superior to them in skilfully tracing out their civilization's principle, without attempting to determine the innermost nature of that to which the soul of man must be subjected. It is superficial to judge the results by recent confusions which may be temporary and caused largely by the intrusions of the lower elements of occidental thought and life. That civilization is not to be condemned by occidental standards which are no less open to its criticism than are its standards to ours. It is not a refutation of its principle that the materials for its realization have been inadequate; for accordant with it is all that science can discover of the world's way. With this congenial inclusion the rigidity disappears, when it is perceived that the way of the world is not static but dynamically evolutionary, that institutions are not finalities but phases of advance. Just this principle, with added materials for working it out, asserts itself in present occidental life.

To many the subordination of the soul to the world works toward the obliteration of the soul by the world.

Science has annexed to the world large tracts of that which had been attributed to the soul, seeming to drive it back to an ever-narrowing range. Personal and social sanctities, exquisite loves, outreachings into the eternal, appear to many to be determined by that which is not soul. The soul seems like one who stands upon an isolated sand-bar which shrinks steadily with the advance of towering ocean masses. How shall spiritual affirmations be heard against the roar of the perilous floods? To many the loss brings little solicitude. For from the contributions of science are received individual and social goods inconceivable to former generations, with promise of benefits now inconceivable. The subordination becomes to them the gain of the world on condition of the loss of the soul. Increasingly vast are the possessions. "Whose shall they be?"—with no soul to possess them.

There is not implied any depreciation of the work to which our time is summoned in its occupation with the world, nor any suggestion of limitation of that labour. Any such hesitancy comes of indolence and cowardice. What we have to take account of is the thought and life of multitudes to whom the subordination is the world's obliteration of the soul. This is accepted all the way from those who form a deliberate judgment to those who are just swept along by a current of the time.

But the subordination of soul to world may be so understood as to construct a moral order of thought and life. And if the spiritual is implicit in the ethical, as Laotsze and his sublime associates conceived it, there may be the disclosure of a spiritual order and a spiritual human life. There is implied in such subordination an assertion of the soul. In seeking what is to be obeyed, not only the intellect but all the powers of the inner life are developed and disciplined. There is something to worship, for my recognition of that which directs me is essentially my worship

of it. There is reverence formative of a society where reverence rules. And as the spiritual literature of China shows, there is the possibility of revelations in the world, revelations of that which is inclusive and consummative of the soul. That world may become spiritual universe, that power the Father as Jesus knew and declared him, that law perfect liberty in the Father's will. But even when the possibility of these implications is not recognized, the subordination may contain great values of the inner life, as in the main current of that oriental civilization and in the scientific consciousness of our time. The noble intellectual and ethical humility is a narrow way of obedience and self-discipline. Science demands: Since these things are so, learn, accept, obey them. The command to learn, accept, obey, is summons to the soul.

Of a different quality is that subordination which is the world's possession of the soul. This is not the flooding of ourselves with the glory of sunset and stars, when radiances and immensities of mountain and ocean and sky pour into us illimitable inspirations, when the joy and peace which is recognized as the indwelling spirit of nature awaken immeasurable depths within us. This we shall find to belong to a different way of relating world and soul. That lower form of the subordination which is the world's possession of the soul, has its classic expression which may illustrate a present tendency.

Jesus' first recorded announcement of his crucifixion, which is the complete victory of the soul against whatever the world may bring against it, was made in the vicinity of the wild grotto of the god Pan. There was expressed the feral life of nature, the animalism which the Greek in one aspect of his many-sided, much adventuring genius appropriated. The Greek naturalness, "the life according to nature," had for its lower meaning, intrusive into its higher significances, the admission of the brutish in nature

to dominate human life. This is a corollary which is drawn by many from the modern subordination of soul to world. World's possession of us is indeed as old as human flesh. Now with the beating down of resistances, the impulses from nature encounter no sentinel angel at the gate. Not only lusts but also violences, both alluring forms and shapes hideous and obscene become for many the constituents of human life. One were blind indeed who should fail to recognize this among the increasing forces of our time.

In industry with its related activities we encounter a subordination which is destructive of men, all the more clearly because of the awakening of an industrial spiritual consciousness. The significance of that beginning, the implication in it of the aims of Christ, is to be pondered later. For its sake, in recognition of its unfolding and latent values, men must face the continuance and recrudescencies of its opposite, must recognize the issues of an industrial strife which is deeper than any other industrial animosities. All is not going as well as optimists desire to think. There is a cant of "service" which protests too much, and aims of its "service" appear inadequate. Still in lands and sections where industrial conditions are comparatively favorable, where the humanistic economic is recognized, the superstition lingers that human toil is a commodity among other commodities: there are frequent relapses into that subordination of soul to world. Looking at a part of the picture, a large part, we see an aim which is the production of things as things, not of the worths and joys of those who produce and use them. In the face of industrial obstacles men revert to the exploitations and strifes, the economic inefficiencies and social miseries which they boasted they had outgrown. Still processes mechanize men, and are destructive of the joys and worths of work, which are the right of every man

toiling, as is every man's right, either with brain or with hand and brain together. Still children are robbed of childhood, women of womanhood, and these exploitations deprive men of justice, decency and humanity. Not only old age but maturity is flung to the scrap heap,—a frightful economic waste. The cynical sage's challenge, "What profit hath a man of all his labour?" extends to modern industry's workers and administrators. In earth's less favoured regions a vast part of toil is the crushing out, the grinding away of the soul. Occidental efficiencies and inefficiencies invade ancient culture and backward races to make things better and to make things worse, to clean and to smirch, to save life and to kill. Still among multitudes in the more fortunate regions, and more generally over broader expanses, human toil works for this destruction. This is the curse of labour, not its hardships, accidents, disappointments, the burden of the day and the burning heat. Increased production and improved distribution are often diffused poverty of soul.

The toil itself is largely repressive of thought and beauty and the other inner values. The gain of longer hours for leisure is not sufficient compensation even when extensive enjoyments in it have been earned. If a man is not "happy in his work" he is not happy in the results of it, for it is the quality of men's work that colors their lives. The demand for a labour that has values in itself is so remote from many prevalent conditions that it may appear to be a dream,—unless it is a seer's vision. The imperative requirement of industry and related activities, in co-operations and leaderships, is that men's toil no less than its results must not be the overwhelming of soul by world. It must indeed be recognized that the achievement is a process. But when this purpose is dominant its consciousness changes essentially the nature of the mechanisms of industry. And the arousements of powers to make hu-

manly valuable both work and its results contain in their beginning, and more and more in their advance, the soul's vital conquests of the world. When this task is really undertaken then the very mechanical forces which are its antagonists either range themselves on its side or stimulate its energies.

A strong tendency in our present education is the subordination of soul to world. Men of the ripened—or declining—years look back upon their school and college and university with mingled feelings of exasperation and gratitude. The world of nature and of men was, in comparison with present teaching, opened to such remote and occasional glimpses, partly because of much less developed science, physical, economic, social, in that ancient time, partly because of the failure of most educators then to recognize the necessity of a knowledge of the world, especially of the social world. The lack was especially flagrant in the misinformation, happily scant, concerning contemporaneous affairs and the forces which were at work in them. Against the exasperation rises gratitude for enrichments of the inner life by men occupied with its powers, intellectual, cultural, spiritual; though many of our guides had only limited appreciation of the world's contribution to interior wealth. Now the life of college and university is more the training for the world than of the soul. This purpose is evident, with exceptions here also, in the extensions and diffusions of higher education beyond academic halls, in educational philanthropies and uplifts, in ministries of the university to the general good.

The exasperation and gratitude include recollections of our earlier school days. Little was made familiar of that which was about us, waiting with urgent demands upon us. Yet with all the antiquated crudities of that elementary and secondary education there were few intentional barriers between teacher and pupil, and a real teacher

freely imparted his best gift, his own great soul. Through the developments of the later movement men and women of genius have emphasized and guided the interior powers, though often with preponderant emphasis upon their application to the world, rather than upon their own richer developments. Now there are magnificent voices which arouse our hope that these antitheses will find their synthesis, and we hear in them tones of the outstanding prophets of the earlier time. To the great voices youth gives great responses. All the more insistent for this summons must be our recognition of forces and tendencies which oppose it.

Even in the most humane religious developments of our time there is a danger of this subordination. The superb protest against the individualistic conception of salvation and selfishly perverted spiritual culture; the vital affirmation of religion as not a creed but a way of living; the practical compassion for human ills; the militant indignations against repressive conditions, exploitations, war and poverty; the consecration that follows the Master in his paths of ministry; the alliance with science and every agent that diffuses happiness and opens the goods of life to men of every attainment and race,—all these are indeed essential to spiritual assertions. Religious leaders who are most earnest in them are champions of soul, with clear recognition of its realization in the world of nature and in man's social world. Their social gospel, social passion, is of the heart of Jesus, for the fulfilment of his aims. Yet every excellence has its counterfeit and may be directed to the opposite of the essential purpose. Unless the soul is saved (and vast is its salvation) unless the soul of humanity is saved, unless the human ministries are openings of the possibilities of the inner life, then even in these benefactions the soul is subordinated to the world.

Only a few of the many aspects of this form of the rela-

tion can be mentioned. Unworthy of note but blatant are self-indulgent idlers and those who would be idle if they could and find a satisfaction in imitating the idlers' ways. There is a busy idleness, often more exhaustive than almost any task, but worthless because it is not a task. It is all the obliteration of the soul by the world, most evidently so in the egoistic self-assertion which demands that the resources of all climes shall be laid at its feet.

To turn to something worthy of regard:—there is the prevalent notion that men and peoples are necessarily what the world makes them. Certainly rivers lead them; mountains restrict them; soils, skies, seas permit one enterprise, forbid another. Athenian culture was simply impossible in the heart of Africa. Yet human life, in races, nations, individuals is also the endeavour, whether successful in a degree, or a failure which is never complete, to conquer the conditions. The distinction must be made between determination by the world and limitation by it. The limitation defines the specific tasks which encounter men and peoples "in the bounds of their habitations." The homely wisdom is applicable here of those who cut the garment according to the cloth, use available materials for a feasible purpose. Great are the differences of situations, inheritances, endowments. Try what you can make of them, soul of man! No enterprise of the one talent body, brain, heredity, environment can make as much as may be acquired by fellow servants of the five talent capital. When each does business with what he has, to each is given equal approval of his faithfulness which is his inner worth. Unto each is the joy of the Master of the work in his constructions of inexhaustible materials, and faithfulness over a few things unfolds to rulership over many things.

To mention one more of the aspects of relating these two constituents of being,—social institutions are of the

world, though they are or have been creations of the social soul. They include folk-ways, industrial, political and ecclesiastical establishments, judicial and penal systems, whatever the social inner life forms to accomplish human aims, though largely shaped by natural conditions and fearfully perverted to thwart personal and social values. Of their world are creeds and rituals, legal and moral codes, conventions. These have no sanctity except as expressions of the soul. Whenever they cease to be that, allegiance to them becomes surrender. Indignant with the betrayals men rise against them. They become objects of the contempt and hate which are the disillusions of reverence and love. Here is the source of revolutions. Institutions, with their creeds, orders, conventions, must always be changing, for the social soul which it is their function to express is continually changing. As having no value of themselves, as continually shifting in response to the evolving life of men, institutions are indispensable instruments, while every imposition of them is for the subordination of soul to world. A significant aspect of our time is youth's confused recognition of what they are not, and much of the present impulse of youth is the flaunting of that partial discovery.

In the subordination of soul to world great values are implicit, so great that they may transform it. They emphasize the knowledge and use of the world. They call us from individualisms to co-operations. They arouse us from dreams to reality. They demand development of body, brain and mind. They require the invention of instruments, the grasp of opportunities. A higher relation is to be discovered not so much by a reaction against this principle as by the working out of its implicit forces,—surely not by any hindrance to that exploration and use of things which is our time's characteristic service, but rather by putting through our special contribution to

humanity; just as the aims of industry are to be won and its present evils corrected not by any turning back to antiquated processes and organizations but by the further development of what has been achieved.

III

Another attempted solution of the relation is the soul's escape from the world. It might seem at first thought that this attempt is so out of tune with the occidental life of our time that one who is sympathetic with that life might pass this answer by. But a closer view discloses tentatives of the escape. And if we may judge by the experiences of other times, more than experiments may be impending. The vigorous phase of India's civilization was followed by the Upanishads. The course of Hellenic culture issued in Plotinus, who blended the voices of many predecessors. An age occupied with the world may, world-weary, try to escape into the realm of soul, just as many a man who is successful in affairs finds with the achievement the desire to get away from it all. "Who has not longed for rest?" The impulse may not be a decadence. One who has tested the world and learned its insufficiency summons deep reserves of power to liberate himself. Against occidental "emptiness and chasing after the wind" sits the oriental calm. The conviction of those who represent a profound impulse must be reckoned with.

Not every attempt to escape the world is of this high order. A large part of human desire seeks to evade both the world and the soul. Here is weariness and its solace of sweet sleep. The endeavour to be free from things, without emancipations of the inner life is in frivolities, dissipations and not infrequently in crimes. People try to run away both from realities and from themselves. Of the same quality is the common longing of the tired and

harassed mind for the heavenly rest, or for oblivion. This field may be omitted from our survey, because it lies outside the problem of the relation of world and soul,—even as Buddhism, the sublimest possible expression of the pathetic impulse, was discarded from the thought of India.

The attempt to escape from the world for the sake of soul may be directed to various provinces of the soul's empire. Into "the intellectual life," "*la vie littéraire*," "the palace of art," the cloister, the soul tries to enter that it may find itself and develop itself. The romantic movement has this distinction, including strains in great romantic philosophies. The determinant aim is the culture of the soul. Many intellectual crimes have been committed in its name and the cant of culture has made large contributions to the world's mirth. But the endeavour is not to be judged by its perversions.

A distinction must be made among the citizens of this fair country, between those who are essentially creative and those whose life purpose is cultural receptiveness. To the former we owe conceptions of the soul which contribute to what is to be presented in the next chapter as the true relation of world and soul, and they are to be fulfilled there. It is to the latter that our criticism is directed.

The criticism cannot be complete until that is presented in which life's values are fulfilled. But there are some evident weaknesses of this cultural solution—or evasion. It is parasitic. The wealths of thought and beauty and no less those of religious sentiment have been achieved by humanity toiling at the world. The intellectual and æsthetic treasures, by what cost of sweat and blood have they been won, not only by herculean labours of scholar, poet, artist, musician, but also by those who through the industrious ages have so shaped the life of man that its dearly bought significances demand to be expressed by deep reflection, interpretative form and penetrative music.

The liturgies of grand cathedrals could not have been except for those who "climbed the steep ascent of heaven through peril, toil and pain." They indeed wrought that we might receive their benefaction. But that gift is lost unless we "follow in their train." A life that seeks development of the soul by escape from the world is inglorious in that comparison.

There is no intention here to separate a certain class of people for blame or ridicule. Divergent aims of life strive within nearly every man. Therefore the comminglings must be examined and it is every man's intimate task to distinguish and judge them. The judgment is that this attempt lacks ethical power.

The deficiency is peculiarly evident and notorious in this kind of moral culture. Essential indeed to the moral life is delicacy of moral judgment, with devotion to moral ideals. Ethical wisdom seeks every influence that refines and strengthens, avoids every suggestion that blunts and soils. But the moral life is a battle in the world and it is better to fight and be defeated than to avoid the fight,—a principle which only a fool will pervert into self-conceited recklessness. And the moral life is a service in the world, and its very nature is lost if that service is not rendered. Without that our alleged morality is self-deluding hypocrisy. At the heart of whatever correctness we have gained is the immorality of pride and selfishness. The ethical essentials, service and helpfulness, are wanting. When the world storms our weak fortress, or when imperative needs of men appeal to our incapacities, we see how useless we are before those tests.

The ethical defect is apparent in those intellectual and æsthetic attempts. Witness Hellenism and the Renaissance. Then we find that the æsthetic, ethically demanded for life's harmonious completeness, diverts from moral good. When the ethical is æsthetically conceived

and character is sought as beautiful, then the ethical is essentially denied. The characters that are essentially beautiful are those which, devoted to serviceable tasks in the world, harmonize and complete the soul for and in those tasks. Religious culture for its own sake is also deficient in ethical power. This recognition solves many puzzles in many men. Amazing are the impurities that lurk in such religion. Subtle as the old serpent are its deceptions. Into the supreme self-indulgence steal baser gratifications. The elevation of the flight measures the disaster of the fall.

There is suggested a warning and direction to the admirable endeavour to bring beauty into religious observances. The inexpressive insensibilities of non-liturgical services, the antiquated dogmatism and clericalism which disfigure liturgies, are becoming less and less endurable. But a service least æsthetic is more religious than one governed by æsthetic motives. Emphasis upon beauty is unbeautifully inadequate to repentant humility before the absolute holiness, to the divine communings which impart forgiveness, consolation, devotion and power for our service in God's world among his toiling children, for the realization of his eternal aims in the work next our hands. The inspirational expressions must be made as adequate to Christ's aims as we can make them. Then the sanctuary may become the glorious place of his feet. Magnificent in prophetic scorn was the condemnation of a religion which had become "as a very lovely song of one who has a beautiful voice and can play skilfully upon an instrument." Not to such music is set the conquering forward march of humanity.

Another criticism is that this aim is unsocial, none the less so because its votaries pursue it together, in intellectual, æsthetic, or religious circles, and with a cosmopolitan free-masonry. For that is essentially unsocial which does

not seek to share whatever belongs to the common lot and common toils. The creators of thought and beauty take all that is human into their hearts, thus fixing their own place in another realm. The unsocial defect hardens the heart and blunts the mind to the deeper beauties, truths, and worths. There is often found among those who are restricted to homely necessities direct wisdom, essential grace, appreciation of exquisite values. They put to shame those who neglect or despise the simple unschooled. The criticism is not answered when the common things of common people are exploited for their contributions to the intellectual and æsthetic life. But when that impulse becomes the democratic endeavour to bring the treasures of intellect and art to the multitude, to blend them with common works and conditions, then its nature is changed, at no loss, but with immeasurable gains from that to which the service is rendered.

When attention is called to the mystical life, creative against our time's subordination of soul to world, it is well to recognize that the great Christian mysticism has always been Christ's ethical mysticism of the religion of the Father's will. Such essentially was the mysticism of Saint Francis. In the later ancient the medieval and the modern occidental mysticism there have been two leaders, Jesus and Plotinus. The influence of the Neo-Platonist has been preponderant in many men and groups. It has infected the Christian mysticism with enfeeblements of task which are impoverishments of soul. We are all mystics though we may not know it. "Thou hast made us for thyself, and the heart never resteth till it findeth rest in thee." But Augustine, affected by the Neo-Platonic influence, did not sufficiently define that rest. The repose which Jesus gives is that divine power which works in us, as the calm, majestic courses of the stars accomplish God's will. If we desire the other we should seek

it outside the occidental consciousness, in a manifestation incomparable in its kind.

India's profoundest thought, which is more than thought, is the supreme instance of the soul's endeavour to escape the world. Yet their attempt is no less open to the criticism of occidental dialectic and evaluation than occidental constructions of thought and life are required to vindicate themselves against the Indian mysticism. The magisterial tone of those who speak for it we do not find imposing. The claim to be beyond the reach of criticism is not an answer to criticism, and the protean elusiveness to criticism's grasp is to be critically considered. To relegate it to the unreal, or to include it in the all-embracing, all-engulfing, seems to us a reiteration which is not an answer. Also our demands for ethically social reconstructive powers are not met by an indifference which pronounces itself transcendent of such considerations. Or if the rejoinder is, that our ethical social efforts have scant results,—there is some excellence in just the endeavour, the West has made some progress since the dark ages, and the deep miseries and poverties of India pitifully appeal to us. None the less do we reverence the calm concentration upon that which is above conception, the evaluation of illimitable inward potencies, the creative recognition of the spiritual universe. All inferior attempts of the soul to escape the world lead to the oriental transcendence above every inner power which seems to be in relation to the world. For the relation of soul and world the soul must not be less nor lower than India's soul.

Other attempts appear fragmentary in comparison. If spirituality consists in that liberation, we must seek spirituality in the profoundest Indian endeavour. This judgment applies to a Christianity which has that aim. It does not apply to Christ. But may not we who are entangled in the world's affairs essay that emergence as far as our con-

ditions permit? The Indian severity repudiates all compromises. Much of our worship offers entrance for a little while into the transcendent realm of soul, the world forgotten,—holidays from our responsibilities there. So especially in European Catholic churches and cathedrals, as read in the rapt faces of peasant women. Christ's worship on the mountain-top was for his service on the plain. In the influence of holy places, in the purifying serenities of sacred music, in prayers of penitence, adoration and divine communion, in the inspiration of words which are indeed prophetic when they impart God's thought and love to be immanences of life's task, we receive the peace and power of God for work in his world.

The occidental intellectual and æsthetic endeavours to escape the world are in comparison with India's way as the crest of Darjeeling from which one looks up to the summits of the Himalyas. From majestic heights we receive that which fills the world with the glory of God.

IV

The relation of world and soul may be complicated by an attempted division in the inner life. A noble part of ourselves may be given to the task in the world, while the highest part is reserved for that which is supposed to be its own supreme development. This conception may be especially prominent after a sudden regenerative advance awakening spiritual qualities whose relation to the world is not apparent. Our inheritance from the Protestant Reformation includes this among its concentrations. It is interpretative of many inefficiencies of the last four centuries.

That rediscovery of God in Christ and of soul immediately in Christ was liberation both from the church and from other dominations of the soul by the world. But it

was faced by the developments of humanism and the Renaissance. That onward movement had not only brought to a new birth ancient developments of human faculties and their appropriation of the world, but was also in the floodtide of new victories and beset by their new problems. The leaders of the Reformation were children of the Renaissance. They recognized its cultural values as God's work and man's task. But theirs also was the transcendent rediscovery of soul. What shall the man do and the community of men who possess the priceless spiritual treasure and also face that other irresistible demand?

Two influences were especially potent in shaping their answer. One was derived from Saint Paul. When it is said that outstanding advances of Christian history have been Pauline, the reason is given why they have been insufficient. The Christ of the reformers was Paul's Christ. Theirs was Paul's justification by faith. Theirs was his consciousness of salvation by the cross. Theirs was his breadth and length and height and depth of the love of Christ which passeth all understanding. That precious treasure they must keep in their urgent task in the world. But Paul could not give them an interpretation of that task, which, as we have seen, was not present to him. They took the interpretation from the church, whose claims to dominion over soul and world they had rejected.

That answer said: there are two orders, the religious and the secular. Both are of God. The laws of each are divine laws. The church's addition that the secular order must be governed by the church the reformers repudiated. The laws of that order must be found in itself, and must be obeyed as God's laws for it, while there must be no intrusion of the secular upon the religious realm.

Calvinism refused to accept the division. Its life of God in the soul of man must be extended into every activity of soul and into the conquest of the world by the regenerated

soul. The sublime refusal has glorious results. Largely from Calvinism flow not only political liberations but also social developments. But it limited its field of conquest. There are secular values which it has not appreciated. And these limitations react in limitations of the soul, in creeds and rules and insensitive inhibitions of joys and worths. Its God is not altogether the Father. Hence its determinism. Its constructions fall short of the religion of the Father's will and need Jesus' faith to rectify and complete them.

When one speaks of Lutheranism, Calvinism, Pietism and of the divisive attempts in each to remedy the defects apparent in itself and the others, there is something more to be considered than the jealous pettiness of sects. They are endeavours to solve the inevitable practical problem of the relation of the soul to the world, to find the unity of life, to fulfil the present and eternal task.

The reformers' evasive solution was the only way for the spiritual principle which they held as the real principle of Christianity. Justification by faith estimates men in their individual relation to God, not as social beings, as Judaism and Jesus regarded them. Though this principle can be propagated from soul to soul and binds men into a union of its own quality, it is not a union for tasks in the world wherein the relation of world and soul is to be realized. The fears of orthodox people who are suspicious of social Christianity are well grounded. Protestantism withholds from tasks in the world the supreme powers of the spiritual life. Along this path the main current of Protestantism has continued unto this day. Any Protestant may look for himself and at himself and see that it is so. Catholicism, though dividing life between the religious and the secular, puts the latter under the control of the former, realized in the Catholic church.

As there are great values implicit in the subordination of

soul to world, except in the perversions which let the world in to possess or to crush it, and great values implicit in the attempt to escape the world, except as one forgets what it is that would escape, so in the reformation's relation of soul and world. The great realm of civilization is enfranchised. Noble interior powers are liberated to possess that realm. The harvests of the past are sown again in new soils and bring forth fruit a hundredfold. Here are vital organizations of humanity and homes for them, gracious with poetry and plastic art and dance and song. Here are magnificent victories over conditions; and the conquests welcome harder obstacles to be overcome, pathless forests to be traversed and the joy of building roads through them, heights that have been inaccessible and the exultation of surmounting them. Here is virtue and here is praise for sweet amenities, heroic devotions. And above all this is the soul's inmost sanctuary where God is found in Christ, the living way.

Therefore in all this there is an intolerable division of the soul. The task is cut off from the inmost life, the most vital energy and notwithstanding its achievements is of sadly proven insufficiency. It is task of powers of soul separated from that power of soul in which is perennial inspiration for all the others, and irresistible efficiency. When the tasks occupy human energies the result is Secularism.

In the opposite direction Pietism plods along its pilgrim way, hedged in on both sides, from the city of destruction to the heavenly city. Its relation of world and soul strips world of capacities of worth, denies values to the powers which are engaged in the practical task. These people seek a better country, that is a heavenly. The world and men's work in it are for them a probation, a testing of the soul. Their resistance to the world is to develop qualities which are not for it. The prevalence of Pietism is gen-

erally underestimated except by Pietists. Those who dwell in other realms find it difficult to believe that many people think and act that way. The aspect of it which is called fundamentalism is more easily refuted than defeated. Criticisms of Pietism must be very easy; there are so many of them. Too obvious to be amusing are the quips and quirks at its intolerances, ignorances, insensibilities to the amenities of life. But one can learn of Pietism some necessary inhibitions unfamiliar to those who ridicule it. Its strength is its opposition to Secularism. It is the sentinel before the inmost sanctuary. When Jesus' way of relating world and soul is so recognized as to be accessible to men generally, it would not be strange if Pietism should be responsive to it.

In this sketch of attempts to relate world and soul we have found some things congenial to the aims of Jesus and some opposed. This brief review has been for the sake of clarifying by the comparison that which we will find to be his relation.

CHAPTER XII

JESUS' CREATIVE FULFILMENTS OF HUMANITY

I

Another construction of the relation of world and soul remains to be considered. Like those already described it is to be viewed in the light of Jesus' aims. It accords with them. Other relations contain elements to be fulfilled in this. From Jesus we receive this construction of the relation: the soul finding, achieving and developing itself in the world. There is emphasized his consciousness of the soul as superior, all-important. There is recognized no less his evangel of the Father's will to be accomplished in all that men do together and are to one another. Sonship, which is brotherhood, is attained as a man performs, with men, the Father's work in the world, which is the Father's world. The aims of Jesus, and the methods of Jesus are in the soul's self-realizing task in the world.

This is a social task, in which every personal task is contained. The opening paragraphs of the last chapter brought us to the social meaning of soul, and to something of the significance of the world of social constructions. The social inner life is fulfilled when the soul of humanity realizes its unity of sonship to the Father in finding, achieving and developing itself in the world. Here are the fulfilments of the aims of Jesus, the accomplishment of his inclusive aim.

What this construction of the relation of world to soul means appears from the comparison of it with those already indicated, that we may see how it surpasses them and what elements of them are contributory to it. In the

relation thus conceived, in the task thus construed, is the regnancy of soul. This excludes the subordination of soul to world, while it inspires indefatigable explorations of both the natural and the social world. These are masteries of the world by the soul.

This relation is exemplified by the labours of physical science. Whatever their various occasions, they begin with the soul's arousing itself to know the world. Scientific processes are intensifications of the inner powers. Every scientific investigation culminates in that conquest of the world to human use which ministers to the larger life of soul in proportion to our integrity in seeking just the actual. Should the work seem to yield nothing except knowledge, this is an inner intensification and development. Though the endeavour is for men's physical necessities, these are conditions of the soul's life, ministries to its needs. To integrity in seeking just the actual belongs the abstraction of any field of investigation from what is not requisite to the given labour, and from considerations to which the scientific result is indeed to be related when discovered, but they may not intrude into the process of discovery. This applies to the field of modern psychology, whose observations, like those of physical science, are properly abstracted from everything but the observation. The same is true in economics and the other social sciences. The supposition that this scientific toil results in the subordination of the soul to the world is contrary to the process of the labour in its beginning, continuance and accomplishment. There is here no ground or rational suggestion of the world's possession or effacement of the soul. Since in our time it is demanded that every work and interest whatsoever shall be scientifically conducted, the whole life of our time demands regnancy of soul. And all these labours are co-operative. The loneliest investigator and toiler must build upon other men's labours which direct

him by essentially social impulses. The most social work is often done in solitude. The work is for social ends, for the union of souls which finds, achieves and develops itself in the world.

This construction of the relation transcends the attempt to escape the world. The two endeavours are at one in their estimate of the soul, in the repudiation of its subordination, in the recognition of its absolute supremacy concentrated upon interior aims. These must be social aims, the devotion of each to all, in whom each work finds itself, each personality achieves itself, in receptiveness, co-operation, and devotion. This leads into the inner social unities, worked out by humanity in its task in the world. To reveal to men their own souls and their unity, to guide into efficiencies and fulfilments of the toil wherein men attain together regnancy of soul, is the prophetic mission which every true man may share. That each may share it to his own developed serviceable uttermost is an essential of Christ's aims.

Always the task is exposed to danger from that which it works upon. It is militant task. One may stop in what has been accumulated, as when a man says, "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years: take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry,"—a suppression of soul which is, most significantly, a retirement from its task in the world. Or the soul daunted by the dangers to itself which its work involves may try to evade some of them. This also is its defeat, for the world has driven it from a part of the field. When the world denies means, the great soul discovers for the task mighty interior forces, and wins, even in sordid circumstances, materials and furtherances for the regnancy that transforms them into its own nature, illumines them with its own splendour.

This principle, in contrast to that which was cited toward the end of the last chapter, admits no division of

the soul's powers between its task and its inmost spiritual life. Every work of civilization requires indeed its appropriate power of soul. There are specific faculties demanded by statesmanship and by participations of citizens generally in forming and developing the institutions of government. There are peculiar powers for generalship of industry and for the ranks, for science and education, for art which demands trained artistry, for the more intimate ministries that exact even finer qualities. In these specializations there are inspirations of great and exquisite interior powers. Civilization is the manifolding of the field of the soul's work, for amazing discoveries of the inner life of men. For its progress in achievements innumerable every vital man rejoices and co-operates, most of all when he regards them as various developments and enlarging values of the human spirit. In all these a man must work with the specialized ability which has been won, the specialized technique, and also with his whole soul. For his most efficient labour he feels pulsating within him through every task the soul of his nation, civilization, humanity. All interior social powers are for completeness of soul worked out in complementary developments of civilization. Only in this personal social entirety are found the aims to which all the works and skills can be directed with assurance of permanent good. Otherwise they become hostile to one another, interest against interest, class against class. Only this integrity can stand against the besetting danger evident in all ruins, that the achievements of civilization may bring weakness and disaster to the personal inner life and to the inner life of a nation and an age, so that the powers which had formed a civilization become antagonistic to one another and the civilization itself shrinks or is swept away.

This construction of the relation is guidance in the industrial realm. Since regnancy of soul is in its task in the

world where it attains itself, all economic rights are determined by the nature of the task. The economic principle must be: to each according to his requirements in this task. Let a man have enough to do his work with. He needs that much and no more, always in the perception that it must be a social task for socially beneficent ends. For the administrator of large affairs his capital, for any workman tools, conditions, opportunities for his best work. Not for any man or woman in any sphere of labour is there required a reward beyond this sufficiency, which includes improvements and expansions of the task. No luxury is admissible for any one, luxury being defined as anything that one does not need for his task. Tools for the work include for every one comfort, physical vigor, wisdom, beauty, love, play, mirth, security, repose, whatever can be used for efficiency. The realization of this principle is indeed an evolution, but it can always be the guiding principle, economically effective. The economic problem is not of remuneration, but of powers and tools to work with. Then the industrial order fulfils Jesus' command: Seek first God's kingdom and righteousness and all these things which the Father knows you need shall be added. There are included means for men's finding their own most socially beneficent service and for discovering in themselves powers to accomplish it.

The task of each person is larger than what he does in the office or boiler-room. Each should have enough for his life's inclusive task, in whatever vocation, and he needs no more. Some labourers could use finer homes than some capitalists can. The scope of the task and of what is needed for it are of course determined by faithfulness and usefulness in it, for these are essential to it. The ministries are various, as of home-maker and mother, of artist or scholar, who if he is a true scholar asks for nothing more than enough to do his work with, work and tools estimated

as the true scholar can estimate them. Old age has its specific tasks, invaluable, and should have enough for them. The same is true of childhood, actual as well as in its potencies, in the earlier years with their rich contributions as well as for future harvests. The task of sickness is victory over pain, and demands curative and alleviating ministries, working in compassionate and reverent love. There are tasks for the incompetent. Let suitable occupation be found for them, and let them be found in it, especially to make them competent; and there is no limit to the possibilities of that redemption.

According to this principle, which is founded upon the nature of soul's self-fulfilling task in the world, every one who has a superfluity beyond the needs of this task accepts the obligation to devote it all, whether it fell into his lap or was earned by himself and society together, to provide more adequately for others' work and development, the provision including therapeutic, educational, æsthetic and recreational benefactions. Compassionate ministries to the helpless are implied when we view their endurance of helplessness as their task. The use of instruments for one's own vocation and for the supplies of others' service unite, and life becomes a serviceable sacrificial unity, on the condition that no part of the price is kept back. At the head of the world's philanthropists are the women who financed the mission of Jesus, accompanying him that they might know how best to serve his work. An essential part of every work and life is the joy of imparting to those who lack sufficient instruments. Here is the glory of the kindness of the poor to the poor, and of their contributions, one with the ministries of their toil, to great causes: a right claimed by the poor widow who gave more than all the rich who from their superfluity cast into the temple treasury.

It is improbable that this principle can be realized by

revolution, or that any bureaucratic system can be invented which is able to find officials wise and good enough to administer it. Yet it can be applied under developments of our present political organization, to the collection and disbursement of public revenues, in alliance with philanthropy and industrial methods and with the growing humanitarian consciousness of our time; and in this efficiency the highest qualities of statesmanship are required and developed. Men must work out this evolution together. It is more widely acted upon every day. Its promise of success is in its quality of supremely productive principle, with deeper and stronger motives than any other. There can be no glut to its productivity, for it produces continually new wants of powers and of instruments to work with. A mistranslation has misrepresented the supreme economist. He did not say that a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of his possessions. He said superfluity, and in his way the greatest abundance is not superfluity. The principle has deepest assurance of success in that it is the economic principle of soul regnant in the task of attaining itself in the world.

II

What does the world become to us in this construction of the relation of world and soul, in the soul's task of discovering, achieving and developing itself in the world? The world meets men in two aspects, as favorable and adverse, friend and enemy, helping and hindering, developing and repressing. This is evident both of the world of nature and of the social world of the constructions, institutions and embodied organizations of men. It is necessary to look at the amicable and at the hostile aspects of the world in the light of this principle and to attempt the unification of them.

The riddle of the painful earth, of the groanings and travailings of pain together, is not solved by any calculation of the relative amounts of pleasure and pain. In life below the human there is found for our vast comfort a preponderance of pleasure, and the stern law of the survival of the most fit works through pain, to which must not be attributed human capacities for suffering, and into larger joy of living. The problem of pain in the sentiency below the human is far from being solved by this reflection or any other accessible to us. But it brings to us the ministry of diminishing the pain and increasing the pleasure in the lower grades of life, a ministry of gentleness for which science supplies increasing materials. It is helpful to our urgent human task to know that it is in a nature in which pleasure is preponderant and which is also a field for sympathetic helpfulness. In our methods of hunting and trapping we must not remain utter savages. The scope of this ministry may become larger than any present imaginings.

In our human life the problem of pain and pleasure is an intimate task of regnancy of soul, which requires the diminution of the one and the increase and refinement of the other, and learns the uses of pleasure and of pain, and demands our work upon them that the soul may discover, achieve and develop itself. But the real problem of the world as hostile has a much deeper meaning. It is of the world as crushing out the soul, a problem vast and terrible, as we see the inner life of men, by millions and billions, overwhelmed by the hostilities of nature and of the world of social constructions.

There are hostilities natural and social which crush the soul as they sweep on regardless of what stands in their path. There are insolent hostilities, as when men use natural instruments and the constructions of the social order to destroy the souls of their fellow men, thus bring-

ing disaster upon their own. And often these social organizations become, without human intent, obstacles and destructions to the inner life. There are treacherous hostilities both from nature and the social world, as when genial climes or agreeable social conditions lull the soul that it may be murdered in its sleep. It is not suffering, heartbreak, death that in themselves appall us, but the overwhelmings of the soul.

The theoretical answers, the reasoned theodicies, are not only unconvincing, they are inapplicable. What have I to do with them or they with me in those urgencies! They do not speak life's language and are not translatable into it. What have they to say to the innumerable hosts of the defeated, to humanity in fierce crises of its long war?

The only answer is to fight and overcome. This is the soul's persistent demand of itself, to assert its own regnancy in and against the hostilities of the world, which are also weapons of perverted characters in their assaults upon the souls of men.

It has been done, even in tests to the uttermost. And all the victories have their supreme expression and fulfilment in the Crucified. They have been won not for the victors alone. They have been wrought in love, for impartations of their power. Their eternal symbol is the cross, expressive of all that can be arrayed against the soul, and of the soul's supremacy over all that can be brought against it. The victory is in Christ's aim, to accomplish in every soul, in all unities of soul, in the soul of humanity, the Father's will, which is the discovery, achievement and fulfilment of soul in its task in the world. Twelve legions of angels could not win for us a victory which is our own. In the irresistible depths of Jesus, in the social depths of humanity God is, with his immanent fatherhood of love and power, Lord of heaven

and earth because God of the soul's regnant task in the world. That power is so deep in every man, so creatively completive, that we trustfully work in it for the final victory of all his children, in the union of all, which is to be achieved in the universal victory. It is idle to ask whether there might not be some other way of life. This is what is offered us. Any other which we can conceive shows small and mean against this way.

Thus the world as the field of the soul's self-achieving task has one meaning, inclusive of its hostilities, pains and pleasures, and also of its co-operations. It is meaningless to ask what the world is apart from the soul's task in it, for the world never meets us, even in thought, apart from that task. It is a world in which humanity can win itself. And the only appropriate answer to its unfathomable mysteries is that a man should do just that, for himself and for others and for all.

For the soul's sake the world must be known, from the elusive elements of things to the farthest beyond the farthest stars, its evolutions and sublimations traced up to the heart of Jesus and the streams from that inexhaustible spring. Whatever can be learned of the world must be accepted as inevitable conditions of our labour in it. This unqualified acceptance is assertion of the obedient soul, which, as the master of fundamental scientific procedure has said, humbles itself to be exalted. There must be mastered the knowledge of the constituents of ourselves and of the inevitable processes of the social world, that they may not thwart us by turning against us social forces which men set in motion without knowledge of them and without ability to direct them according to their implicit aims. The work includes as magnificent achievements the invention of physical and social instruments of knowledge and power.

The world in all its elements must be learned in their

relation to the basilar needs of men. The knowledge and efficient control of these elements for the humble purpose is a development of the soul. Men plant in the soil spiritual harvests of industry, patience, and ministering love, of gratitude to the creative power. Men make highways in the desert to humanity's holy city, to the kingdom of God. What they weave is his living garment. What they build is his temple. Conquests of things are self-attainments, personal, social, spiritual. That the soul may not be subordinated to the physical needs, thus subordinated to the world in which they are supplied, their relation and service must be found to that essential of us which does not live by bread alone.

It is not the negative type of virtue that is required in the acceptance of this relation. That dread of danger to the soul is defect of its faith in itself; and cloistered virtue, which is not of faith, is sin. Jesus has shown the identity of unbelief and fear, "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" The soldier who skulks away from the field may be exempt from the vices of his comrades who meet the enemy, but the contempt of the least morally cultured of them is an echo of the eternal judgment. So are the jeers of real boys for the immaculate who avoids the boy's world in which boyhood wins itself for man's world. One who does things has slight regard for "the timid good." The mess of politics is better than self-indulgent or supercilious omission of a voter's duty. It is just that men should reject a Christianity that shirks the world.

The distinctions which are to be made here are derived from the acceptance of the world as field for the achievements of the soul. A man must enter every conflict armed and prepared. To the failure of the unarmed and unprepared there is to be given Jesus' unlimited compassion. The judgment which he forbids, that we be not judged,

is the perversion of the moral insistence whose purpose is to arm and prepare men. It is also necessary to grasp the difference between participation in the soul's task in the world and the allurements which unfit us for the task. It is the difference between strategic courage and reckless folly. Practical applications of this distinction are the wisdom of fatherhood and motherhood. Always the loins must be girded about. Always must the lamp be kept trimmed and burning.

It is not one's post in the field that determines excellence but the faithful performance of the task in the place where one is stationed. But this judgment must be understood as a corollary of the true relation of world and soul. It must not be perverted into limitations of tasks and powers. Essential is the development of every potency to the uttermost of service, that the humanity in which we serve shall develop itself to the completion of service in its task. This contribution exacts enterprising faithfulness in work next our hand. He that humbleth himself in his work shall be exalted to better work there or in a larger range. There is a false contentment, a supine acceptance of repressive conditions. A social order is self-condemned which favours such surrenders for the multitudes, whether it is an aristocracy feudal, industrial or bureaucratic. Ease and pleasantness of occupation are not to be considered. Honour is due to those who prefer hard work and who welcome hardships in it. From among these humanity, and sometimes the church, has chosen its saints. May they pray for us and work in us! Enlargements of service are not to be estimated by any standards except those which are implicit in soul's self-achieving task in the world. The wisdom of some women has followed love's supreme call away from brilliant careers, and has found larger spiritual life, with deeper ministries, in the exquisite humility which is woman's

highest exaltation. Ambitions for the task are of a different quality from other ambitions. When external conditions or physical limitations or deficiencies of talent are insurmountable, then the soul works in restrictions which are not suppressions, attains its place in the true aristocracy which levels upward, of those who are faithful anywhere.

> "'Tis the performance, not the part, that wins
> Approval from the Master of the play."

Then I said, I have laboured in vain. I have spent my strength for naught. Many of my toils have come to nothing. The constructions of laborious years have fallen like a house built upon the sand, when the floods come. It would be a degrading comfort to expect heaven's joys to be given me because I tried,—a celestial booby-prize. I was not working for them any more than for material rewards, but for serviceable success in my work. The fear of that failure has darkened my life. The conviction of failure embitters it, a failure chargeable to my own mistakes and incapacities.

Such reproaches may be salutary. They help us to see what to do and what not to do next time, unless we permit them to crush the courage and buoyancy of the task out of us. As memory goes back over life's sorrows it encounters life's joys: as it reviews the failures those things appear which we have done well. And life has comforting surprises, as of grateful people whom we had almost forgotten who tell us of a helpfulness of ours to them which we had not suspected. There are harvests as of winter wheat long buried beneath the snow. Or growths ruthlessly plowed under were leguminous cover-crops whose purpose was a richer soil. The consolations meet in this encouragement: in the losses there have been gains of your own soul. And every such gain has been

gain for others. For every achievement of soul is by its own personal social necessity advance of humanity's soul. The outstanding instance of failure was Jesus at the end of his mortal ministry. The supreme success was the winning of himself to be humanity's inmost soul in its task in the world.

In all knowledge and efficiency of that which is most insufficiently called secular work, there must be increasing consciousness of the soul, not as apart from the world, but as accomplished by its task in the world. One who knows this relation goes to every work with indefatigable faith, courage and energy. His efficiency spreads from man to man, unites men in unconquerably joyous labours. Civilization unfolds in power and splendour, harmony and joy. It is all the accomplishment of the Father's will, in men's constructions and institutions, in natural objects included in the task and transformed by it, in all the works that men have to do together, in all their relations with one another.

The world gives back to us increasing materials to work with. In discoveries of the world we find ourselves. Achievement in the world is self-mastery. Development of the natural and social work is larger interior life. Whatever a man constructs is the revelation to him of his own constructive energy. What civilization accomplishes interprets humanity. This is most evident in obstacles overcome, practical problems solved, hostilities conquered.

Thus the beauty of the world is won. Something of the meaning and function of beauty in Christ's way of living can be better attempted in the final chapter. At this point is emphasized its place in the winning of soul's task in the world. Beauty is indeed natural in the sense of its immediate peculiar pleasure to that which we are naturally. It is manifest in the child's happy reactions

to the world. Unless childhood is withheld from the child he is born into the beautiful garden of pleasantness. Exquisite is the pain of our regrets for the lost paradise, for our childhood's joy of living in a delightful world. Life's task for ourselves and for our ministries to others must regain that beauty and delight as responsive to the soul achieving itself in its task. By creative and purifying toil poet, artist, musician win it back for us, not by leading us away from men's work in the world, but by revealing its significance, awakening in us the poet, artist, musician won by creative and purifying toil. To the soul growing by its task grows the range and intensity of beautiful things, and these are echoes of the soul. If this is not accomplished, an essential part of the self-achieving task in the world has been neglected. Even the child's lost Eden may be won back, and with what larger meanings. There are lives beautiful and strong in whom that childhood unfolds, with every deepening mastery and devotion, into a universe of beauty in which the child's delight is still an element unimpaired.

This responsive beauty of the world, its awakening of beauty in the toiling soul of man, is rightly said to be a haunting beauty. It is spirit that haunts us in the beautiful natural world of our labours; not as realized for our thought and action, but as dim intimation, uncertain partial recognition. The intellectual attempts to construe the world as souls in unity have not convinced the world's thinking. And our practical tasks also encounter objects and mechanisms as yet irreducible to the inner life. Any answer beyond that relation which is necessary for the soul's task at every moment seems, if not presumptuous, at least premature, without sufficient and sufficiently defined materials. Yet we must not lose from thought and life the magnificent attempts toward the spiritual unification of all reality, in an all-inclusive spiritual universe.

To the Indian endeavour to reduce the world to illusion the world returns spiritually transformed. The systems that strove to construct world from thought or will, though the concrete actual has been too stubborn for them, retire for reinforcements to attempt the task anew. The reason for the repulses may be the soul's insufficient developments. The labour may be ever incomplete, yet more and more progressive. Some alluring thinkers who accept the concreteness of things endeavour to trace in every element of the world that which is purely spiritual. They have few disciples for their constructions, but more lovers whose hearts are touched by their bewildered vision.

There are connected with these intricacies of thought the simple impulses of children and childish peoples to attribute human qualities to objects of their immediate interest, in their attractions and repulsions, benefits and injuries. This intuition has had superstitions, futile or horrible. It has also risen into Hellenic humanism, which gave to woods and waters furtive forms of exquisite human beauty; and in Shelley pre-eminently the passionate love of nature greets radiant spiritual presences,—difficulties to thought silenced by his incomparable music. When the uncompromising science of our time sets human life into the evolutionary process, connects us at every point with nature by indissoluble bonds, especially when science reflects upon the human perceptions and faculties by which observations and experiments are made, the question arises whether the scientific process and achievements are not larger discoveries of soul, whether the consummation of science's task in the world is to be less than a spiritual identification. Whatever we find the world to be, the task in the world includes our enrichment by every order and beauty and vast splendour which awakes the beauty and glory within us. The Semitic consciousness of this magnificence is deeper than the

Hellenic. It is completed in Jesus' companionship with mountains and stars and lilies of the field and with the natural bases and forms of human life. It recognizes the supreme soul in all the world. Into this heart of the divine mystery we follow him.

No limit of extent or duration can be assigned to the world in which is the self-realizing task, which is broader than the earth and deeper than the sea. The problem of the world's beginning issues in irreconcilable antinomies. Their interpretation is that our faculties are for and in our task, have no function apart from that and need none. But the mysteries around us and before us are the homeland, endless, boundless, for the soul's uncircumscribed task of discovering, achieving and developing itself in the world. There is a limitless and endless world for the inexhaustible, eternal soul. The soul, the least of all seeds, reaches up a slender blade from the earth in which it has been planted. Beneath it are the broken earthern barriers. Above it are the immeasurable heavens. Within itself is the potency vast as the vastness of the stars. It has seen death overcome, and receives impartations of that victory which makes death the entrance into the enlarged task. The yet impenetrable mysteries are assurances of transformations and penetrations of that which it is to work upon with more than mortal instruments. This consciousness is of a social task, from which no personality can be omitted. Each person, who is from and in and unto the unity of souls, finds every other to be essential in the unity of all, in the universal and eternal unfolding. The eternal hope is not of escape from the world, but of the regnant task of discovering, achieving and developing oneself in the world. It claims from the world the world's imperishableness, whatever evolutions await. It claims for the world its own imperishableness, in whatever phases of spiritual advance.

III

To humanity in its self-realizing task Jesus comes, not with a novelty, but with the fulfilments of his word and deed, his life and death. He completes what the great of all times, in prominent or obscure labours, partially realized in their discoveries, achievements and developments of soul in the world. He recognized the groping onward of humanity, pitifully distressed and scattered, with disastrous wanderings, stagnations, reverses. This task of humanity is the Christian philosophy of history, so far as Christianity is of Christ. There are anticipations which he clarifies, powers divided which he unifies, lost which he restores. He so revealed the task as it was then and there in his Israel that its universal principle and eternal energy were disclosed for the one work, of every man and of humanity, of discovering, achieving and developing in the world nothing less than soul.

Essential to his mission was his concentration upon the work that was given him to do then and there. His omissions were essential to his fulfilments. As futile as for the administrator of a great industry to attempt the labours of his subordinates, or to master the various handicrafts which he combines for production, would have been attempts by Jesus to plan out the functions of civilization. It belonged to his leadership of men that he should leave to men those attainments and responsibilities. If we could imagine a Christ supremely competent in the constructions of art and science and able to anticipate and direct their unfoldings, even that fancy could not be so irrational as to suppose that the teachings of his words and deeds would have been other than they were. The great master of the work is the last to interfere with his workmen. Instead of such meddlesomeness he requires that every detail and combination shall be directed ac-

cording to his aim, just as the administrator of an industry requires that all the movements of his workmen shall serve the industry's purpose. When we recognize the aim of Jesus as unrepressive, creative energy, we recognize that the success of anything done by any man or nation is conditioned by faithfulness to his aim. For even the ministries to physical needs are in order that work in them shall be the development of the soul.

Jesus' emphasis upon the soul was emphasis upon its self-achieving task in the world. He devoted himself to the saving of it, the light of his holiness discovering and consuming every impurity, selfishness and hatefulness and unfilial unbelief, everything that diverts it from its task. He called men back to the love and power of the forgiving Father, that they might fill the world with the all-forgiving, all-redeeming love. He came to seek and to save those who are lost and that which is lost, the lost world. His urgency was for that repentance which revolutionizes the inner life and purifies all that proceeds out of the heart. He opened height upon height of the Father's thoughts that soul and world might be guided by them. His fulfilling work was the new creation of men and of the life of humanity. For the sake of soul's self-achieving task he revealed every human relation as the saving of the soul, in fatherhood and motherhood, in brotherhood and friendship, in all men's work together. He made every buying and selling the mutually serviceable, ennobling touch of soul on soul. Every greeting becomes the recognition of a soul's dignity. He transforms secular relations of every kind into spiritualities. He makes of his disciples, in whatever serviceable occupation, a Christlike influence, intense as unobtrusive, of rebuke, summons, inspiration, as when the passing of a holy and loving woman along a city street is felt like the sun breaking through a dreary sky. He sent his disci-

ples everywhere to proclaim the gospel of the soul's salvation, as every step of a disciple upon whatever errand is to be directed to that goal, in willingness, by him imparted, to do and suffer everything that men might be saved. All is revelation of soul in its task in the world, guidance for the discovery and completeness of itself in its sacrificial work. For the soul is to him nothing passive nor isolated. It is action. Its life, its being, consists in its task, which is the reign and kingdom of God.

The labours of the task are known to experience and by experience. The spiritual idealism of his Christianity receives them objectively. To want them different, except as we may make them different, is as idle as to want constellations and atoms different. To know why they are as they are is learned by work in them, learned progressively, ever incompletely. The sociology of Jesus is as faithful to the actual world as it is faithful to the nature and demands of the soul in its liberative obedience to the Father who is Lord of heaven and earth.

Two great words of Jesus are Come and Go. The ineffective body that has come to him or been carried to him goes empowered for toils worthy of the instrument he has restored. The distracted mind which has come to him in wild and vague groping for sanity is sent to its rational service among men. He called the multitude by his irresistible attraction, and he sent the multitude away, to do the common work of the multitude according to his revelation to them of the Father's will. Those whom he summoned to his intimate companionship went with him and went from him on enterprises of his ministry, that they might go into all the world. To every man and to humanity he says Come and Go. The going fulfils the coming, for he goes with his own everywhere into accomplishments of the work which his Father gave him to do, which he gives us to do.

In Jesus' salvation a man gives himself in repentance, faith and devotion to the Father, and in the Father's love gives himself to other men. So losing himself he finds himself in the Father's life, in human life where the living God is. The soul finds itself in action. All that it receives is for action. That action is ministry concrete in the real world. Every word and deed of Jesus, man of action, is instinct with his personal social consciousness of each life in other lives, of all lives in God's life. Every personal emphasis of Jesus is social emphasis. Every social emphasis is personal emphasis. He knew that no one is anything apart from others, apart from the Father in whom is the unity of all. Every withdrawal from men and the task of men is diminution of the soul,—of the nature of suicide. Every widening of social life is deepening and intensification of personality. Selfishness, exclusiveness is the outer darkness. It would be extinction were it not misery, in which is the longing to feel the light of human eyes illumined by the Father's love, the grasp of human hands empowered by his redemptive compassion. That restoration is for action with others and with humanity, in the all-unifying love and power. In that fatherhood, Lord of heaven and earth, is the task together of all men, God's task in all men, of discovering, achieving and developing the soul in the world.

Jesus' practical spiritual aim has no trace of sentimentality. It does not stop with making men comfortable and their life pleasurable. Comfort and pleasure are instruments of soul's efficiency. Only when so realized is there happiness in them. If need be they may be dispensed with for more effective instruments. Even the gracious service of making a little child happy must be the development of the soul of childhood for a child's lovely ministries. There is a philanthropy which enfeebles its recipients. Lady Bountiful is partner with Gradgrind.

Not silver and gold for the indolence of beggary but the power to arise and walk is what the beggar needs. Not agreeable conditions for the criminal, but discipline, which is the redemptive penalty of crime, with restraints which are instrumental to the discipline, is the best hope of society's protection, so far as it has not learned prophylactics against animal tendencies and the conditions that foster them. Sentimentality in another aspect infects labour's demands and its organized efforts for them, but not in noble leaders whose claim is for the unrestricted accomplishment of the soul in its work in the world, with sufficient instruments, material, cultural, spiritual, to achieve its task and manhood and womanhood in it. Such leaders have an increasing host of organized workmen who learn from them and from him who learned in his earthly and his heavenly Father's shop in Nazareth. Even the illumined economics which has annulled the "iron law of wages" may not be free from this weakness, nor progressive national and international statesmanship, except as they unfold into Christ's aim and way. Sentimental in the weakest sense are misery-breeding endeavours to protect against the irresistible laws of men's task.

Jesus' fulfilment of the soul is by the consummation of Israel's law whose purpose is the accomplishment of the divine will in all personal social life. That divine will is the Father's will. That law is the Father's law. Because it is of the Father it makes obedience the child's glad, free devotion, and unites all men in mutual service whose goal is the perfected unity of humanity's inner life. That law he transferred altogether from prescriptive externalism into the personal social inner life, where obedience and liberty are one blessedness, and from which pours transformed conduct into the world which the soul transforms. And he united every human power, relation, ac-

tion, into the great commandment of love. This is his way of the soul's fulfilment of its task in the world.

It is well to think penitently of what might have been that we may better strive for what ought to be. In this practical repentance humanity may review its record of achievement and failure, of advance and defeat, as before the judgment-seat of Christ mankind confesses its sin. In the true relation which his life proved true, not one energy of the inner life would have been unexercised or limited, nor one constructive organizing power of government, industry or culture. There would have been free course for heroic adventure without its enslavements and massacres; for industry in which production of things would not have cost destruction of men; for commerce uniting nations, climes and races, without exploitations of the weak and sordid and incredibly wasteful wars; for science fructifying new soils for plants of life to grow, without the invention of destructive agencies; for cultures not built upon oppressions and slaveries which inevitably ruin them; for humanity united in work for the good of all, not divided into oppositions which have made the resultant so small in proportion to the expended energies; for talents set free among those who have been the submerged and despised, in manifold enrichments of the world's life. It would have been a task far more experimental and scientific, more laborious, adventurous, heroic, sacrificial, a liberation of all human powers directed unwastefully by normal aims. None of the departures from that way can plead necessity, for every departure has been loss, misery and degredation, in the divine justice immanent in God's world. Mankind's repentance before the judgment-seat of Christ is the acceptance of a new civilization which is the fulfilment of that which is implicit in all human progress, a new creation of humanity for the accomplishment of humanity's inevitable task of dis-

covering, achieving and developing soul by its work in the world. The results of the evil ways have made the undertaking fearfully complicated, yet not too appalling for Christ's redemptive power.

IV

Jesus' revolutionary fulfilment of the relation of world and soul is evident, both as revolution and as fulfilment, in his concentration upon those whose needs are most urgent, and whose opportunities are fewest. That service, he taught, is primarily unto "these least." "The last shall be first." For the golden chain of humanity is as strong as its weakest link, which must be made strong. A building is as secure as its most insecure part, which the builder must make secure. The march of a regiment is as swift as its slowest man, who must be trained for speed and endurance. Industry succeeds when it raises the unskilled into efficient productivity and purchasing power. Commerce expands when it makes large buyers and sellers of those who have been on the margin of subsistence. A nation is judged by its poorest and its worst, for they manifest the limitation and weakness of the nation's powers; and, by the same rule, a nation is judged by unfortunate sister nations, especially by those who are in closest relations to it.

In behalf of the neglected are the developments of the wisest leaderships. Jesus gathered about him a select intimate company and imparted himself to them that they might have the greatest to impart to men's greatest needs. Strong and fine souls attach themselves to those who learn most deeply of Jesus, in order to learn that deepest wisdom. In his energizing of men wealth is for the enrichment of the poor. This is his motive for its production, now notoriously insufficient, since so many are so little productive, while wealth is so ill distributed

and misapplied. Wisdom is for the enlightenment of ignorance, which is a solid wall against the advancement of science's use of the physical world and of the possibilities of developing men and social organizations. Beauty is for the transformation of ugliness: a city is beautiful in the measure of the beauty of the streets and homes where its workmen live, and of their resorts and working-places. Character seeks the moral redemption of the morally deficient and perverse, and so attains the holiness which is redemptive to the uttermost. Compassion impelled to crying need creates finest instruments and skill sufficient to save, in the love of Christ who had compassion on the multitudes, whose necessities are greatest, whose perils are most imminent, and he was sufficient to help them. Spirituality purifies itself as he is pure when it takes up his cross and follows him on his mission to hell, which is all about us.

From these ministries, and from those to whom they are devoted, flow back for the enrichment of their servants and of humanity, wealth, skill, wisdom, beauty, character and the choicest spiritual treasures. Jesus unlocks unimagined forces of social welfare. As earth and sea and air and sky contain vast unrealized potencies for human good, so the forgotten of every race and clime are reservoirs of unsuspected powers and glories, when blind eyes are opened, captives released, the bruised set at liberty, and the poor have his gospel preached to them.

It was the supreme wisdom, ability, beauty, holiness, fellowship with the Father, which called to himself the weary and heavy laden, that he, the meek and lowly of heart, might give them rest. He took into his arms the little children of the poor and blessed them. He set a little child in the midst of his disciples, central for all his disciples and for the world's life. We listen to him while he holds close in his arms the little child. His efficient

love surrounded itself with foul shapes of disease. Into his heart he received the imbruited and polluted. He was thronged by the multitude and responded to the touch of that one in the throng who felt most the need of him. He accepted with divine gratitude the outcast woman's fragrant menial service, the rain of her repentant tears, the touch of vile lips purified when they kissed his feet. He was the good shepherd who seeks the lost sheep until he finds it, and rejoicing he carries it back on his shoulders. He accepted the most repulsive indignities that insolent cruelty can inflict upon the most despised, buffetings and spittings in his face. For him were the malefactor's scourge, and nails in hands and feet, and he took the crucified criminal with him to Paradise. He shared the worst that men have to endure. Ministry to the extreme need of body and lost soul was his passion. By that passion the world is judged. Against oppressions, exploitations, spoliations, insensibilities, sounds his voice: See that ye despise not one of these little ones. His most terrible warning is the fate of the man who dug the impassible chasm between his own feasting and the beggar's misery. The ultimate condemnation is for those who do not render intimate relief to the hungry, the thirsty, the sick, the homeless stranger and the prisoner, in all whom he himself is served or rejected. Therefore such ministries can have no taint of condescension but are performed in reverent humility to those we serve. Humanity's task of soul in the world is centred upon the least of these his brethern. It is not enough that we turn aside at intervals to do this as an occasional work. The whole life of humanity must be concentrated here.

In Jesus is the fulfilment of the divine education of humanity by the little child's helplessness. Of the forces that have resisted brutishness, the child's hand has been the strongest. The child's cravings have taught to selfish

mankind sacrificial ministries, have brought against superstitions the supreme religious faith, perfected in Jesus, of the divine fatherhood. Through the little child the animal impulses have been sublimated into holy love. The competitive struggle for existence is by the child's necessities transformed into Jesus' law. That this law might have the strength of man's animal inheritance it has been evolved in animal life. Jesus builded upon this impulse which he extended universally into the unwearying care of all helplessness, the lifting up of feebleness into strength, of ignorance into wisdom, of the last and least into the soul's self-fulfilling task.

There have been eminent thinkers who addressed themselves to an intellectual aristocracy, not supposing that their thoughts and ideals could be intelligible to the multitude. Some of the highest intellectual rank have indeed been exquisitely compassionate. Laotsze's injunctions of kindliness to the populace read like Jesus' sermon on the plain, except—and how great an exception!—that the Chinese sage has little suspicion of the latent capabilities of the multitude. Buddha stands facing Christ in universal compassion; but Christ did not need to expect other incarnations of those who have not yet the capacity of complete redemption. Jesus offers the kingdom of God to the least in intellect, in character, in spirituality. Where there was mental deficiency below capacity to receive his grace he restored it, and bequeathes to therapeutic science the work of restoration. Jesus opens to every man of every race and clime that personal social task in the world which is the unfolding discovery of soul.

In Jesus' revolutionary fulfilment is included experimental knowledge of the world, with complete acceptance and skilled use of facts and processes. So in ministry to the unfavoured there is required the same acceptance of the actual. They till the soil, small owners, tenants,

croppers or labourers. They work in factories, in the least remunerated, the most irksome positions, when they can get work at all. They are in the inconsiderable, insecure occupations, if not in the misery of the submerged. They and their wives and children live in unsanitary tenements, or are evicted from them. Some of them are in almshouses, asylums, prisons. Some of them have not where to lay their heads. They include the poverty-stricken peoples, the undeveloped races. By what scientific processes of agriculture and manufacture, by what educational methods that find their minds where they are and take them where they ought to be, shall they be physically, industrially, culturally, morally, spiritually redeemed? Reliefs, comforts, pleasures are not enough. The consolation of a better lot hereafter is not enough. Their participation in soul's task of fulfilling itself in the world is alone sufficient. To that restoration all the powers of humanity must scientifically devote themselves.

The service which immediately confronts society in its present stage of development is the abolition of poverty, for to that undertaking science and the scientific organization of industry in its inclusive sense and the growth of the social passion have brought our time. Poverty of material resources, comforts and enjoyments means, under present conditions, for all but a gifted few, poverty of thought, of beauty, of self-attainment, of social ministry. The abolition of poverty must extend as deep and wide as Jesus' compassions. There must not be poor people or poor peoples, not any spot on earth for want in body or soul. The redemption of poverty of soul includes the prison and the brothel, fed largely from the same conditions which produce material poverty. Whatever in our present order does not work for this urgency, such as luxuries and unproductive financial manipulations, has no excuse for being. There is not involved a

repudiation of our present economic system. He who denies its evolutionary nature repudiates it as much as the communist or anarchist. In all evolutions new things emerge, new forces assert themselves. To work in our present order is to work for its developments, among which the abolition of poverty is now emergent. To these least must be opened the fulness of every man's task, of humanity's task, which is the fulfilment of soul in the world.

CHAPTER XIII

JESUS' CREATIVE FULFILMENTS OF OUR TIME

Jesus' creative fulfilments of humanity are for every man, in every time, under whatever conditions, but they are as multiform as are developments of soul in the world of ever changing aspects. There are in our time unprecedented materials and powers for attainment beyond even the hopes of former days. They work for real and permanent good on the inviolable condition that our time shall direct its resources and potencies by Christ's aims in the soul's task in the world. In this chapter very familiar things will be mentioned, but their implications are not so familiar. Their American aspect will be noted, because the opportunities for their fulfilments are especially favourable there, and the inherent responsibilities are especially urgent there, responsibilities for the life of mankind.

I

At the beginning of this book the scientific organization of industry was emphasized as characterizing our time. This is indeed an evolution of the last century and a half especially, dating from the great inventions which have issued in the scientific industrial age. But we encounter today a new phase of that evolution. Because the phase is new it is experimental. Many dislocations and reverses are evident in it. Its new problems are not to be solved easily. Wrong answers are to be expected in the search for the right answers with long experiment and labour. Agriculture, textile industries, coal mines present to us

some of the difficulties of our present enterprise, forbid an unsympathetic optimism, an undiscriminating enthusiasm. There is poverty in the most favoured places, and heavy is the poverty in the regions, peoples, races unfavoured; and the world-wide poverty checks the advance of the favoured places. Great organizing industrial forces, administrative, financial, have their principal labours still before them. The supreme labour is to make the industrial advance the progress of human life in its joy, character, spiritual values. The significance of this phase is that it is centred upon the labours of men, of men the toilers. The depth of this significance is that it is the task of the development of soul in the world. And the first place is assigned to the laborious millions who through repressive ages have been the last and least.

Not in the enormous increase of wealth but in the diffusion of that increase is the importance of the present advance. That practical statesman represents America who has said recently, with his ministry to the unfortunate behind his words, that America can now undertake the abolition of poverty. This is one of the great historic prophecies. It contemplates the abolition of the poverty of ignorance, ugliness, immorality, unspirituality. It is militant against greed and its material indulgencies and wealth's lust of power, and is for the full life of mind and heart and soul. This undertaking can have a sober confidence because its benefits include men of all conditions. The industrial forces that work for the abolition of poverty are not for one class separately but are for the increase of the wealth of all. The normal work of the more favoured benefits themselves and the less favoured. The progress of those who have lacked opportunity is for their ministry to the general welfare, ministry to be filled with Christ's aims in soul's task in the world.

Important is the passing of inhuman and uneconomic

conceptions in both the conservative and the radical schools. The result is not so much a new economic science as the discriminative use of the results of earlier studies, developments of them both, the conservative and the radical. From the former the economic laws have been established which are applicable to new conditions. But the conception of economic man as a robot, the tradition of "the iron law of wages," which condemned the masses of men to restrictions of their humanity, the assumption of a social and industrial order based upon these limitations, the exclusion of attempts at amelioration as helpless against irresistible mechanic laws grinding humanitarian hopes to pieces, these sordid superstitions are disappearing except from greed and prejudice. In the old radical economics, socialistic, communistic, even in the anarchistic, we recognize their humane insistence upon the welfare of the least fortunate. From economic radicalism also the contributions are many and great to the improved order and that which is evolving, though class consciousness often obscured the human consciousness, and implacable indignations against the wrongs of the exploited aroused hate of the more favoured in condition or endowment; and many methods recommended, from revolutionary violence and sabotage down to curtailment of production, have been against the interest of those who were championed. The thought of both schools was too much occupied with material goods. In neither was there the clear recognition of the task of soul discovering, achieving and developing itself in the world.

The present economic thought is rich in great human implications. Its conception of men the toilers, which is not a mechanical conception, is of man in all the normal interests of his life, which are to be developed by and in his toils, and supreme among these values are the wealths of truth and beauty and character and love. The signifi-

cance of human life as achieved by its labours is now the supreme economic interest. The unity of all men in their work, whether they be administrators, financiers, craftsmen, agriculturists, home-makers, or whatever they may be, demands that men grasp the meaning, the purpose of that unity. If the work is for material goods as the end of life then the soul is crushed by heavier encumbrances. Only the impulse from the inner life of men continually renews itself. That which is material tends to waste away. The only social unity sufficient to harmonize conflicting interests is the unity of the social soul. Superficial interests diverge, become hostile to one another. Though they combine in common material interests these form larger hostile aggregations. There is only one sufficient, permanent and universal harmonization. These are among the great implications of the present developing economic order. They are implications of the aims of Christ in the soul's self-fulfilling task in the world.

There are now greatly increased rewards of labour, for work professional, administrative, financial, technical and for those who are called labourers, also for those who capitalize men's previous labours. These rewards are larger opportunities, therefore heavier responsibilities. When received they acquire the quality of the hand that takes them, of the man who does with a considerable part of them not what he must but what he will. It is important that he should have in every case enough to use as he will, that his life should not be constricted within the necessities for its mere continuance. When the remuneration is insufficient its use is largely prescribed, though it may be misapplied to the impoverishment of even the necessities by folly, waste or profligacy. The larger the remuneration the wider generally the range of choice between things good or less good or among evil things. The present economic aim is that remuneration for every toiler shall be

enough for every opportunity and development for himself and for those for whom he toils; and of these expansions there is no limit. The well-founded expectation is that wages will evolve with the progress of efficient scientific production. What will men do with them? They do all sorts of things. When used right every expenditure is productive power for themselves, their dependents, society. Its use most useful, beneficent, is told by the Master of the works of men.

The world's hope is an industrial hope in the inclusive sense of industry, but a hope especially for those who have been the neglected and oppressed through the ages. As we watch the luminous dawn of a brighter industrial day for them, though not unthreatened by morning mists and clouds; as we observe the advances that are expressed in higher wages, which tend to participations beyond the wage system, and are based upon increased and more economically efficient production; as we count the rolling up of investments and insurance by workmen, till the gap between capital and labour shrinks and at some points disappears; as we approve the increasing statesmanship of labour unions in their amazing great federated democracy, which are forming co-operations of employers and employed; as we rejoice in the gladness of the new comforts, pleasures and refinements of the workers' lives, and perceive that these gains are not by exploitations of society but by service to it; and above all when we recognize in their faces and feel in their presence dignity, confidence and appreciation of life's values; we are aware, notwithstanding obstacles and perils, of implications and potencies of soul's self-fulfilling task in the world.

It is a strangely belated discovery that the workman is consumer. May this familiar statement, which will presently be amended, be dwelt upon a little, that its spiritual implications may be clearer. As a great multitude of

consumers they must receive from their production sufficient to buy with if there is to be a sufficient market for production. High wages are a fundamental economic necessity. Men have neglected the market at hand in accordance with the proverb: "A fool's eyes are at the ends of the earth." They have chased the end of the rainbow for the gold that was beneath their feet. The consumer—and here is the amendment—must be productive consumer. What he receives and rationally spends and invests returns in productive power. He himself becomes a greater productive power. This principle, like every other, is evolutionary. It works on to higher remunerations, larger productive powers. This is industry's unvicious circle and it is the circuit of the earth.

It means that every ill paid man is an undeveloped industrial asset, as in city slums now contracting, on Southern plantations where the Negro tenant and cropper are now emerging. The creation of more distant markets has to be accomplished in the recognition that consumer and producer are productive one, as everywhere the advantage of buyer and seller is one. Every drudge in a Chinese factory, every porter of an oriental city or across African plain and mountain, all the poverty-stricken billion and more throughout every continent and island and upon every sea demand in the name of economic law enough for best development of their work and themselves, with larger wants and larger means of their supply. This is the principle, the unvicious circle, of international, intercontinental, interracial commerce and industry.

What are the limits of demand for the increasing productiveness of supply? There are over-productions, but for production in general the limit is the inherent demand of every man to achieve to the utmost his task in the world, and for this demand he requires supply beyond the instruments which any man now possesses. When every

person has enough for his productive energies in the co-operations of men, even then the limit of production will not be reached, markets will not be saturated, demands will not be supplied. For in every person the world over, there are powers undeveloped, unimagined, for the accomplishment of his serviceable task. Beyond the work which our generation, the present phase of our civilization, envisages there are mightier toils. The limit is not in what men may receptively enjoy but in what they may contribute, not in their possessions but in their potencies of creation, not in what they may produce for material ends but in what they may create for the creation of soul. The great economic task, in which every ungenerous injustice is an economic folly, every exploitation an economic crime, is the stupendous Christian task.

The Malthusian dread disappears when men attain a normal standard of living. Nor need the process tend to the mechanization of works and men. The machine is no more to be dreaded than any other instrument of work, any other extension of hand and brain and soul. Its manifoldings of productive efficiencies turn men out of work, but to other and larger works, as the leadership of American labour perceives and proclaims. How the transitions are to be effected without serious temporary loss is one of the problems to be solved, one of the energies to be achieved. The rapid creations of new industries productive of human welfare and efficiency are beneficent enlargements of soul's self-achieving task. And the machine can cover only a part of what men have to do. Even in handicrafts there are finer, more beautiful and serviceable productions than are within the scope of a mechanical instrument. For them is required the direct creativeness and skill of hand and brain. For an essential part of his work man develops the machine for efficient mass production and economic standardization. But his task, even

in the masteries of the machine, extends far beyond its scope and continues to extend. Like every servant the machine may become the master of the soul. Mechanization is our time's peril, overcome only when it is made the instrument of soul's self-fulfilling task.

Shorter hours of labour mean increase of leisure. Its function in life's task has already been indicated. Upon its use or abuse, its strengthening or weakening of soul, depend industrial efficiencies, and their contributions to leisure are demands upon the soul.

The increasing unities of industry, both within industrial units and in the organic working of these together form industrial democracy. This does not mean that the craftsman shall do the administrator's work, any more than that the administrator shall do the craftsman's work. Each is dependent upon the other's specialized skill. They have entrusted to one another themselves, those dearest to them, their own and their dependents' career and task. Mutual consultation and representation is involved. That reception into financial participation by which workmen become capitalists, with clearer perception of the function of capital, is involved in the co-operative unity. Evident in the unity of capital and labour, of administrator and workman, is the social nature of soul's task in the world. That social unity is implicit in the great combinations of our time. Through all their perversions, against all their crimes, a mightier power than any other that they wield is the inherent necessity, upon which their success and toleration is conditioned, to work out social purposes. Even here, and we may come to say, especially here, is the implication of that human unity of soul's task.

The scientific organization of industry has these possibilities, these implications. But though an evolution the present phase is all so new, so experimental. Destructive follies and crimes of the past, though they do not appall

us, sober us, for they continue as potencies of another disillusion. There are so many problems unsolved, many possibilities unreckoned, many failures that topple down the constructions around them. Innumerable obstacles have been only partially overcome and we know not what others are in the way or what sudden accidents await us. There are so many elements of the problem that are still obscure. An error undetected may work on to miscalculations that stultify the conclusion. Much has been accomplished. Improvements have been consolidated. How large their scope, how really beneficent their workings it is too soon to estimate. And there are so many foolish people engaged. What wisdom can counteract their folly? One inexpert hand may wreck a delicate mechanism. The multitudinous parts are so intimately interrelated that one maladjustment is capable of wide disaster. The foolish turn into folly the counsels of the wise. And there are inveterate impulses of reckless greed and lust of power and idle, luxurious waste among all sorts and conditions of men. Impatient hands pluck the unripened fruits of the tree of life.

The industrial gains are shared by so few, within such narrow limits. Even in favoured places in favoured lands there are multitudes who are poor. As we look Eastward from the American continent, of which broad stretches have slight participation in the benefits of the new industrial age, the areas of prosperity are less and less, on into industrial deserts and jungles. We cannot assume a continuous process of expanding economic good. Repressive conditions around us and beyond us imperil what has been won. It is not alone the danger of war, which is portentous threat against industrial organization. War is the consummation of many destructive evils.

If the favoured go on to greater success, and even if the scientific organization of industry becomes world-wide,

what is the real human gain? There is no gain in the ignominious relations of world and soul, in the soul's overwhelming by the world, or in the world's possession of the soul. The apparent gain is loss if it becomes the subordination of the soul to the world. As a man reviews his own life, its only real benefits are seen to have been in its conflicts when soul thrust the world out of itself, asserted its own supremacy, achieved soul's self-fulfilling task. So it is with nations, civilizations, humanity. The industrial advance which is the responsibility of our time can be made secure and beneficent by the realization of its implications according to the aims of Christ.

II

All the teachings of Jesus must be interpreted by the aims of Jesus. This principle applies to those teachings of his which have often been regarded as specific directions, economic, forensic or political. In the three chapters of Matthew's gospel which are called the Sermon on the Mount and in their Lucan parallels we read that if a man sues us and takes away our coat we should let him take our cloak also, that we must give and lend just for the asking, that we are not to resist evil men in their insult and violence. These sayings must be interpreted by his aims. Otherwise they yield no consistent meaning. Their meaning is as deep as it is practical when interpreted as it is evident he intended them to be.

The question of their substantial authenticity is not difficult. We can indeed seldom be sure of Jesus' very words. Here as everywhere we must be careful to detect misapprehensions and intrusions. But in general these and other similar sayings occur in the most reliable parts of the synoptics, from the most dependable sources. They bear the stamp of his style. Only if they were found to be in-

consistent with his aims, which are our chief critical standard, could they be assigned to original misunderstanding or to a later reflection.

Two evasions are hardly worthy of mention. One of these characterizes such passages as "interim ethics," applicable to those who looked for his return in irresistible power "to smash this sorry scheme of things entire." That this is the opposite of Jesus' intent is the contention of a thoroughly critical scholarship. The explanation is inconsistent with his life and ministry. Such a construction built on such sand is less than ethical, even if the postulate of the expectation of his speedy coming again could be correctly attributed to him. An interim ethic is time-serving opportunism. The universal quality of ethics is denied.

Another evasion refers these passages to the political conditions of Palestine in his day. It is obviously a government official who makes requisitions of time and labour. Roman insolence and Herodian misrule backed by Rome were violent and insulting, dragged men before a corrupt court, demanded property under the guise of gift or loan. Resistance makes matters worse: better submit with a good grace. The explanation has this much of plausibility: Jesus was opposed to any political resistance or thought of it on the part of his people. The sound sense of his position was fearfully demonstrated later. And such a good sense accepts its policy in details. The application of his injunction to the political situation and its exasperating incidents could not fail to be made by his hearers and was useful to them. But the ethics of Jesus were not merely for certain times and places and sets of conditions. Universality belongs to all those sayings of his, the rock upon which every man and humanity must build.

It is not an evasion to interpret these sayings of Jesus in accordance with the method and style of Jewish teach-

ing, which was referred to in a previous chapter. In such exhortations, that which we would call a principle, but which is to the Semitic mind a concrete power straight from God, is presented by an extreme instance. An example is Jesus' command to pluck out the right eye if it causes a man to stumble. The meaning is plain even to the occidental mind: Any bodily loss is less than any moral wrong. Yet a statement in occidental style is weaker than the Semitic impressiveness. Such presentations in Jesus and other Jewish teachers are not prescriptive but vitally illustrative. In all his sayings it is necessary to see what principle,—to use the pale Western word in the great Semitic meaning—Jesus is presenting. In The Sermon on the Mount he makes unmistakably clear what this principle is.

This principle, this divine will, is that which is expressed in the great commandment and in The Golden Rule. But in The Sermon on the Mount it is love at its task in an evil world where it encounters greed, violence and hate. It is love to our enemies. It blesses those who curse us. It does good to those who are outrageous in wrongs against us. It prays in the secret sanctuary of the soul for those who insolently exploit and persecute us. The prayer for them is not merely "that they may be brought to repentance and a better mind," but that to them even in their hatefulness the joys of life may be given, even as the heavenly Father sends upon the evil and the good his blessings of the sunshine and the rain; and the life empowered by prayer fulfils the prayer. Comparable only to Jesus' all-loving death, agonized by human hate, is this commandment of love tested to the uttermost, so revealing its divine majesty, its all-conquering power.

They alone are incapable of being insulted who are too despicable to assert dignity and worth against insult, and among these are some who are considered great. What

do they care for execrations if only they get what they want? Men of the other sort are not insensible. Insults awake in them a sorrowful compassion, even as recognitions by appreciative love are dear to them. The divine fatherhood is not insensitive, nor are his children in whom God lives and feels. Their task is to overcome insult by the Father's illimitable compassion. Life's task at its highest and hardest is a love perfect as the heavenly Father is perfect toward the unthankful and the evil. This is no passive sentiment but the indefatigable work of doing good where the effort encounters seemingly invincible resistances. In this task are discovered and developed the supreme powers of redemption which forbid us to despair of men even at their worst. In such a life there are no retaliations of word or deed, but their noble and loving opposites. In regard to property, the command is not that we should waste it where it will do the most harm. But the unselfish and serviceable use of property is to be without limit. The repeated emphasis of the divine fatherhood as our standard of conduct in an evil world guides us to the depths and simplicities of Jesus' meaning. What human fatherhood and motherhood do for ungrateful children when that fatherhood and motherhood are from the supreme fatherhood, that we are to do to evil men in an evil world.

We deny this principle,—rather this loving will of the Father in his faithful children,—when we oppose it to wisdom and manliness which are essential to it. Indiscriminate giving and lending are not commands of Jesus. They are wastes that work not good but evil. They are not of the supreme serviceableness which he taught and lived. They are repudiations of responsibilities, shirkings of our obligations to all men. Nor is there any command of Jesus that we must stand inactive and let oppression, spoliation, murder, rape and massacre work their will

upon the defenceless. Such cold cowardice is not in the spirit and aim of this supreme love. The moment we recognize that this love works by wisdom and fortitude, innumerable practical problems are upon us, as of economic efficiencies, public, national and international security, not as exceptions to love's way, but as this supernal love's achievement of its aim.

To what music may the soul march and dance along the way of its task in the world? How may men do their work with the buoyancy, the joy, the mirth, the laughter, which are requisite to heroic qualities? Jesus' answer is an unanxious faith. He did not tell us to take no thought for the morrow. The mistranslation is eminent among devastating stupidities. At this point the King James version is as foolish as he. Luther wrote for another great Bible-reading people, "*Sorget nicht*," "Be not anxious." Something of the difference between the more carefree people and the heavier-hearted race is traceable to the different translations. For the English translation not only fails to remove but also makes heavier the burden of care. How much misapprehension has that misreading been accountable for! Good sense when uninformed of what he really said has passed it by. People less sensible have consigned his philosophy of life to a region where their work could not be done, have thought of him as a dreamer of pretty dreams, not the master of the works which men have to do together. Even in respectable literature this misapprehension still continues. And those devoid of good sense have been confirmed in their incapacity, foolhardiness, planlessness, unpreparedness, as if such a trust in God were any better than trusting to luck.

"Be not anxious." If only that darkening of the heart, that hindrance to efficiency, that burden of the soul, might be removed! Our best things have been spoiled by it. Upon the interchanges of friendship, the paradise of love,

has fallen this distorting shadow. We come out of the art gallery, the temple of music, the sanctuary of religion, and at the door this ugly thing is waiting for us. We have walked through beautiful landscapes, through rich experiences, and this has dimmed their exquisiteness and glory. There is an excellent Jewish saying, "For whatsoever good thing thou mightest have enjoyed and didst not thou shalt give account in the day of judgment." "O God be merciful to me a fool!" There were generous adventures, beneficent services, that we might have undertaken, but care made us afraid. Most of our anxieties for the morrow were refuted when the morrow came. They needlessly embittered days that might have been so sweet. We shunt our worries to the shoulders of others, of our dearest, and our own not a whit lightened by the cruelty. On the street how many anxious faces! The pathos of children when unvexed by care is that soon upon their backs shall ride, as in the Arabian tale, "the old man of the sea." We civilize childish peoples to the loss of their natural capacity for happiness. By the removal of anxiety a vast part of the world's sorrow would be lightened. That burden Jesus wants us to let him take away.

The sources of anxiety are partly in conditions, partly in the soul. Insecurity of handicraft, business or profession, from conditions beyond foresight and control, make anxious faces and heavy hearts. The scientific organization of industry works toward an unanxious world in which men may be sure that an industrious and rational life does not fail of production sufficient for themselves and their dependents, against interruptions of sickness and accident reduced by science to their minimum, and for the years when strength decreases and fails. The implicit aim is that men may be certain of instruments and opportunities for soul's task in the world. Security of conditions makes for peace between nations as well as within them. Anxi-

eties breed international distrusts. Fears set men and groups and nations into oppositions to one another, and fear is a root of hate. To the relief of care and its brood of evils is directed Jesus' leadership of the works and relations of men. But this progress of conditions is in an early stage and can never completely overcome "the chances and changes of this mortal life." We would not wish life to become less adventurous, and progress in conditions opens more heroic adventures. Jesus looked upon a world weary and heavy laden under inveterate conditions of anxiety. To men as they were situated in a world whose actualities were clear to him he offered the unanxious joy which is implicit in soul's task in the world. In every age the soul may anticipate the noblest developments of humanity, may realize in the inner life the kingdom of God.

The cause of anxiety, as Jesus teaches, is the divided mind. The remedy is the concentration of all the powers to "serve God," the accomplishment of the Father's will. Only unto God, in the service of God, can the whole man be concentrated. In this service of God one need not be anxious for what he shall eat and what he shall drink and wherewithal he shall be clothed. Paganism, whether outside of Christendom or within it, is the anxious seeking of these things. All these things shall be added unto him who seeks first God's kingdom and righteousness. Here the shrewdest earthly wisdom is contained in the heavenly wisdom. Efficiency and success come to the man who is devoted to his work, not to him for whom it is the means of other things. The application of this principle to the beneficent productiveness of modern industry is obvious, against the "ca'canny" method and every diversion of men away from their work to its exterior rewards. Yet it is none the less heavenly wisdom. It is the obedient child's trust in the world of the Father's care, where we

and the birds of the air are fed, where the grass of the field is clothed with beauty, assurance of God's beautiful arraying of our serviceable lives. We are not to be distracted by any intrusion of the service of Mammon, lust of the flesh and lust of the eyes and vainglory of life, source of fears and frets and bitterness and futility of the dissevered soul; nor for accumulations, to be distinguished from the increase of instruments to work with. By the task and in it are attained the imperishable possessions. Moth and rust cannot spoil them or wear them away. They are out of the reach of thieves who break through and steal. He who sows the seed of truth and honour, of righteousness and love in the hearts and lives of men, in the world's soil, need have no anxiety for the results of his sacrificial labour though they are long delayed. All the powers of God's universe work for the ripening of that seed and God works with them and in them. A man may dismiss even that solicitude, as one who having done the sowing of his wheat sleeps and rises night and day, assured that he shall put forth his sickle to reap the ripened grain. For every trusty and trustful man in his Godward task, for the world of men, there is buoyancy and joy. This is the way of happiness and energy and peace, for humanity to accomplish its task in the world.

III

Social institutions are instruments of the soul's self-fulfilling task in the world. The science of their reconstructions by the aims of Jesus is destined to occupy much of the place occupied by theology in former years. Spiritual realities which theology sought apart from the secular organizations of human life are resident in them. It belongs to the limitations of our subject just to indicate at this point some present implications of Christ's institu-

tional fulfilments. Those institutions are selected whose implications are significant for other institutions also.

The chief of these is the family. In its present state, tendencies and problems, what implications are there of the true task of soul in the world according to the aims of Jesus? The right answer to this question should expose the contrary tendencies. The importance of the problem is evident from Jesus' evaluation of the family. In his estimate the monogamic bond is of the very physical nature of human beings, is inherent in the fundamental constitution of society. "They are no more twain but one flesh." In the family with this immovable basis he found the immanent revelation and realization of what God is, of what men are to him and to one another, the unity of humanity in the Father. In accordance with his estimate, which is scientifically confirmed by the examination of human experience, the monogamic family must be valued as the indispensable safeguard against brutishness, the spiritual sublimation of ineradicable impulses, the heart of human progress, the center upon which human life converges, the source whence issue the streams that make humanity the paradise of God. Personality is socially formed in wedded love, in fatherhood and motherhood, in the relations of son or daughter, brother or sister. These attainments of social personality are to be extended throughout humanity, with strengthenings of their original sanctities and devotions. They are the life of men from and in and unto the Father. The family is an evolution, in its structure, its conditions, its universal relations, its spiritual being. What present evolutionary tendencies are implications of its purer, stronger, finer fulfilments?

It is a time of mourning for the decay of the family, and of exultation over its alleged decay; of dread lest the fundamental safeguards and sanctities may be disastrously weakened, and of joy in the prospect of impulses unregu-

lated. But for defence against the dangers in this day of unconventional iconoclasm the recognition is necessary that some changes and sources of further change are for the strength and worth of the family. Some unfavourable conditions are evidently transitional phases of a favourable process. For example the growth of cities becomes by improvements in transportation the transfer into suburban conditions exceptionally happy for children and parents. The preference of many college alumnæ and other self-supporting women for the personal and social realizations of larger, finer life than a marriage may offer them, is demand for that wedded life in which this impulse has larger and freer scope. Of a similar significance are some escapes from marriage bonds. And many distractions from home life are potential enrichments of it.

It is not a loosening of home ties if there is the passing of arbitrary government of children and of unregulated authority upon them, of unparental exploitation of their slavish labour, of society's indifference whether parental responsibilities are fulfilled. Not detrimental to the family is the equality of husband and wife in person and property. Against marriage is a wife's subjection to miseries and personal degredations without relief or escape, and to excessive child-bearing. The purpose of marriage is not that children may be born but that they may be born into conditions and opportunities of happiness and usefulness, for the training and accomplishment of soul's task in the world. There is no standing-ground between this principle and promiscuous breeding. For this fulfilment of the parental impulse the wife and mother has the initial responsibility. No civilized man forces a woman, wife least of all, to bear a child against her will. Not contrary to the permanent unity and beauty of family life is the extension of a wife's range and service into new tasks when these are enlargements of mind and heart and soul for

the supreme task which husband and wife, father and mother, accomplish together. When she receives remunerations these are enrichments of the home. In some places a woman teacher loses her position if she marries. A wiser way would be the educational utilization of those, educationally equipped, who know life as a wedded woman knows it, know children as the mother supremely knows. The elimination of such women from the higher education of young women, which is now administered almost exclusively by men and unmarried women, is a manifest absurdity.

Not against the family is the opening of its privileges to those whom economic conditions and traditional conventions have excluded from it. There are many companionate marriages (it is a shame that the term has been defiled) which are not only safeguards against illicit relations, but are holy and indissoluble, working out good and happy results, and undertaken and fulfilled "reverently, discreetly, advisedly and in the fear of God." All these changes bring new problems, often answered wrong. All these forces may be perverted into degredations and destructions. Yet implicit in them are larger fulfilments of social good in deeper wedded love and more effective childward tenderness.

For marriage is a task for man and woman together in the accomplishment of soul's self-fulfilling task. There are some who must fulfil that task alone. The same motive and principle that commends marriage for most excepts these few. For most men a woman's partnership is indispensable for his best development and service. For most women the supreme task is best fulfilled in wifehood and motherhood. Without the task together the glories of romantic passion fade away. In the task together romance becomes mightier, lovelier through all the years. Favourable to this true marriage are the scien-

tific organizations of industry, the increase of leisure as an essential of life's task, the relief from domestic drudgeries by science's domestic ministries, liberations for wider experience and service. Happy are husband and wife who have the same employment, like the Curies and many others, or when the employments are of the same quality, as with the Brownings and many others. But in any case the specific task of each may supplement and contribute to that of the other, converging in the one unifying interest of childward care, made more affectionately efficient by what is brought to it from enlarged experiences and services. Then the love of man and woman is the assurance of an eternal task together in eternal life together, and the words "till death do you part" have no meaning. The thought and aims of Jesus are the basis and power of the true romance eternal. There are homes where marriage as the united task is ideally fulfilled. Where it falls far short of ideal fulfilment we can yet recognize the implicit meaning, and that forces of our time are working for its realizations. Here as everywhere all depends upon the direction of these forces and the overcoming of hostile forces by the aims of Christ.

Divorce is a monstrous evil, and monstrous are the evils attendant upon the denial of divorce. Now as in Moses' day there must be considered "the hardness of men's hearts." The state is at war with the social evil, and when a marriage relation is ministrant to the social evil "because of the hardness of men's hearts" then the state annuls that marriage. When to those whose aims are the aims of Jesus a marriage is no longer a marriage but a degredation, and that completely hopeless, when it is against the accomplishment of the Father's will and soul's personal task in the world then the aims of Jesus must decide. Where a marriage has thus ceased to exist, with no ethical possibility of renewal, then the question may be faced

whether another marriage will best serve personal sanctity and the sanctity of the family, the social good, the personal social fulfilment of soul's task according to the aims of Jesus.

The family is best safeguarded by the chastity of the married and the unmarried equally, of men and women obligated by the same standard. Every sin of the flesh attacks the heart of humanity, as does every incitement to the sin of the flesh. The test of a nation and a civilization is its pure-mindedness, and upon that depends its permanent progress.

Personal purity is not merely a repressive inhibition, whose outbreaking perils are evident even to the psychology of common sense and common experience. These perils are averted when self-restraint is the love and adoration of the pure, the holy. The most unscientific psychology conceivable is that which invites the mind to occupy itself with their opposites. Purity is indeed not best secured by evasions of what we are physically and of actual life and conditions, but recognition of the power of suggestion is necessary in all presentation and discussion. Especially must this power be recognized in the instruction of children, which is never to be entrusted to the careless or incompetent. The two safeguards of innocence and intelligence must be united. Difficult and delicate is the responsibility. In literature and art realism is not pruriency. A frankness that is brutal, an unreserve that is insensible, the nauseating reiteration of sex problems, are of the same nature as hypocritical prudishness and lead to the same results. Concerning things that meet our eyes everywhere:—not to be condemned or feared are changes that make for freedom of movement, efficiency and beauty. They tend also to healthy-mindedness and to right social conditions. But the vile, as it leers at us from some depraved motion pictures, from prostitutions of the dramatic

art, from pornographic news-stands, must be dumped into the sewer.

Sex is more fundamental than our most obsessed psychologists present it. The soul of a woman is forever woman soul. The sex impulse is good and beautiful in its sacramental sublimations. It is hideous when directed against the worths of life. The personal social aims of soul in its task in the world are alone sufficiently regulative, redemptive, consummative of it. These are to be extended to the most unfortunate, the inexpressibly most pitiable in body and soul, not by driving them from one polluted place to another to be polluted, from hell to hell, from one system of degredation to another, nor by a supervision, avowed or concealed, which tolerates and fosters the worst of evils; but by giving them physical restorations, conditions, opportunities and incentives of decent living, so that they, not as objects of condemnation but of redemption, may "go in peace and sin no more."

Concerning government,—one remark upon the great institution which is called the state must suffice to indicate its implications of soul's self-fulfilling task in the world. The antiquated conservative economics of *laissez faire* gave government too little to do. The antiquated radical economics, except the anarchistic, demanded too much of it. Against the former, government is more than a policeman, even as the guardians of the peace are more than that in their discriminative courtesy, shrewd helpfulness and democratic good fellowship. Our genial though not always inerrant friends, the police, refute the conception of the state as just a policeman. On the other hand a government is less in scope than bureaucratic despotism. What government does or refrains from doing is to be determined in every place and case by the practical question whether government can do it best, and whether local, state or national government can, all things and tendencies

considered, do it best. There are cities, especially some European cities, where government must attend to the housings of the poor as a humane and economic necessity; other cities where capital can undertake the work, for a fair return, with or without governmental partnership, but never without governmental supervision. Sometimes public utilities are best administered governmentally, sometimes privately, with the government watching. Free education is government's function. It includes the education of the public in practical matters, and this function of government is destined to a wider scope. Enlightened governments extend free education into technical schools and the university. There are therapeutic, recreative, cultural works for government to do. Step by step with the advance of the scientific organization of industry, governmental beneficence advances, for these two are not competitors but associates. The great organizations of industry are becoming not so much under government control as operative with government for the best service and productiveness. This applies to governmental safeguards against appropriative spoliations. There is required a governmental business policy designed and administered for the public good,—not for private favouritism. Partisan rivalries, wastefulness, inefficiency, corruption, tend to diminish,—flagrant instances to the contrary notwithstanding. Restrictive traditions, obsolete theories are yielding (the process might indeed be speeded) to the requirements of social benefit. Similar are the co-operations of government with private philanthropy. These distinctions of field and work, these partnerships with private initiatives and efficiencies are more than economic in the old sense. They are directed to the joys and values of life. The endeavours are "of the people, by the people and for the people." They are results and formations of the democracy that achieves itself. The distinctions and co-operations become the more

effective the more they realize their implicit destination, soul's self-realizing task. As this service develops, men's pride in the state becomes a more devoted and enthusiastic patriotism. My country, with its sacred symbols, is expressive of the deepest needs and values and joys. As national unity she has her indispensable function in humanity's task. Our glorification of her is chiefly because of her contributions to other nations, her ministries to the peace and progress of mankind.

The brief criticism of our chief cultural institutions, in the eleventh chapter, a criticism not indiscriminative nor unappreciative, I trust, must be left to the reader's further reflection, as he may view them in the light of the aims of Christ, which are directed to soul's personal social self-fulfilling task in the world. May we now adventure a step within a field of fiercer controversy?

In the power of Jesus' victory the beloved community, of every creed and no creed (yet they all consciously or unconsciously or with a dawning consciousness are in the discipleship of Jesus) continues his task, in his devotion. Their impulse moves them to the worship of that to which they devote themselves, by whatever name they may call the object of their devotion, or leave it unnamed, by whatever conceptions they may think, or leave as a mystery beyond thought the inmost being of that which they practically adore. Their personal social task, uniting them in efforts for all personal social good, is power which draws them together for worship and praise. In the fulfilment of that impulse they impart to one another every experience of the joy and power and illumination of that which they revere together. They attract others and desire to attract all into their fellowship of worship. And this worship brings all human affairs before the judgment-seat of that which they adore.

Where members of the beloved community worship

together there is the church. The impulse that forms it is irresistible and the church continues as long as soul's personal social task continues. This impulse demands the largest and freest expression, that all the task may be filled with worship's sublime spiritual energy. Those who deplore the limitations of the church in our time should also recognize that these limitations are concentrations of its function which is indispensable to humanity's great task. Many of its ministries are now rendered more efficiently by other agencies and when it attempts to extend them it finds the ground already occupied. Its assertions of spiritual realities are uttered by other voices also. A prophet of the soul does not need to speak in its name nor as its representative. Its assumptions of authority over thoughts or affairs have no longer any place in the world's life. Human progress sweeps its obstructions and oppositions away. All this is for the concentration of its spiritual power, for its penetration of life with worship.

There is no place in this filial brotherhood of worship for distinctions of Jew and Gentile, between men of different creeds or of no creed. When the impulse of worship is expressed without restrictions it is then social worship. Those who are in the discipleship of Jesus and whose worship is of the Father need have no fearful unbelief that this impulse upon which the light of Jesus is poured will fail to follow him.

This freedom of the spirit requires no new organization, no sectarian addition to the religious divisions which war against the soul. In the church, or as we are obliged to say, in the churches, there are forces that work for this freedom. To ally ourselves with these is in accordance with the spirit of real worship. This applies to synagogues as well as churches, and to church and synagogue as one brotherhood of the spirit. It applies to the universal

brotherhood of seekers after God. Just as we may find, if we will, that conversations peculiarly spiritual are those held between Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Christians, Orientals and Occidentals, when the purpose is not to convict one another but to receive and impart, because then men forgetting their divisive differences meet on the highlands of the soul, so it must be when credal and ecclesiastical barriers no longer thwart the impulse of worship to bring all men together.

When this worshipful social impulse works out its implications, expressive forms and efficiencies grow from the impulse itself. It recognizes and appropriates the expressions of the past, as temples, cathedrals, glories of religious literature, painting, music. These and new expressions and efficiencies have no sanctity except as expressions of spiritual reality. They change and develop, inclusive of the spiritual wealths, beauties, majesties of every realm, which are summoned to worship and adore. In the fulfilment of this impulse prophetic voices have largest and freest scope. For the deeper the worship the wider and mightier is its spiritual power to penetrate soul's personal social task in the world.

The fellowship of men realized in worship embraces all other fellowships and is their inspiration. It converges upon the most neglected. It is spiritually educative of children and the childish. It draws with intense evangelism those who need it most, to reveal to them and to inspire in them the fulfilment of soul's task. By the social worshipful impulse are realized reverent compassions, delicate and efficient helpfulness, transfigurations of the hardest lot and the most thankless toil. The church as efficient expression of the personal social impulse of the serviceable soul to worship that to which it devotes itself need fear the loss of nothing which belongs to its function. Its losses of other things are to be desired not feared.

IV

Jesus' creative fulfilments of our time are the ways of peace. It is a sober and experienced judgment that sees in war, with its present instruments, in a world as now organized, nothing less than the destruction of civilization, to join the ghosts of the civilizations that have perished. The realm of death is moved from beneath to meet thee at thy coming. The civilizations of the past stir in their graves: Art thou also brought low? Art thou become as one of us? The destruction of our civilization would be a vaster calamity than theirs since it is an organism of far wider extent and of greater potencies of universal good. That phrase, the destruction of civilization, connotes woes and degeneracies unthinkable, unimaginable. Yet it is a term of insufficient horror, because with the destruction of civilization values even more fundamental are destroyed. If the chief dangers were from outside its circuit then we might feel strong enough to repel them. But they are implicit in it, not only from the devastating lust and greed, ignorance, prejudice, folly, hate, poverty, wrongs, that continually undermine its foundations, but also in the very constitution and organization of what our civilization has come to be. The close interrelations of the nations threaten world-wide catastrophe. Economic and industrial forces work not only for peace, but always, and now much more than ever their rivalries are fruitful causes of war. Science, handmaid of our civilization, contains potencies of devastation of city and country, for indiscriminate ruin and massacre wider than the worst of the past. Our achievements are not securities. They are perils of illimitable scope, until they are directed to better purposes than now prevail, and guided by higher aims.

It is not enough that there has grown a greater detesta-

tion of war. Men want peace until they are inflamed by emulations, grudges, passions, hates. Then they want war. There are remorseless knaves in high places. There are many clever politicians who, seeking peace, seek also what they present as national advantages. For their sake they risk war. Into concerted efforts for peace these perilous interests intrude. There are wrongs that will never be settled until they are either settled right or else settled wrong by war which produces added wrongs. When strife is kindled, and any accident may kindle it, it lets forces loose that work uncontrollably against human will. All rational instruments of peace are to be furthered in the recognition that they are but instruments and that to be effective they must affect the fundamentals of society.

Sufficiency is to be found in nothing less than the direction of human achievements by the aim of Christ. This direction is their mighty development. Every one of them so directed works powerfully for peace. He is Prince of Peace not only because he inspires the sentiment for it but because he pours into the life of mankind constructive aims and powers for soul's task in the world whereby humanity becomes one efficient brotherhood accomplishing the Father's will.

CHAPTER XIV

THE ETERNAL IMMANENCES

I

The task of soul in the world according to the aims of Christ includes the beautiful. The religion of Jesus is full of beauty. This appreciation is lacking to those who praise the splendid loveliness of Hellenic art to the depreciation of Christianity. The early church's inheritance of Jewish undiscriminating intolerance of paganism was insensible to the glory of its temples and sculptured divinities. They were abominations to Christian eyes. Much of the early opposition to Christianity was because, as then proclaimed, it stripped life of æsthetic values. This was one reason why its appeal was so largely limited to those who were deficient in culture. Later blendings of the Hellenistic and the Christian were attempted additions to the Christianity of Jesus, rather than recognitions of his truth and beauty, and could not prevent the iconoclasm which has robbed us of priceless artistic treasures. In the outworkings of the Renaissance the beautiful and the Christian as then conceived tended apart.

There are indeed great artistic achievements which reveal Christ and his creations as essentially beautiful. Many of the finest of them have been lost to Protestantism in its revolt from Catholicism. Even in Catholicism which in its use of art restricts it, and in Protestantism much more, there is a fear not only of art but also of the love of beauty. Protestant movements of great moral power such as Puritanism and Methodism have opposed æsthetic values, not so much because of insensibility as in

dread of their seductiveness; not so much fearing a supposed tendency to the life of the flesh as a drawing away from the life of the spirit, from its heroic energies and conflicts. The complete recognition is needed that Christ and his creations, as they are supremely true and good, are also consummately beautiful. As his truth and goodness are completive of all truth and goodness so the kings of art bring their honour and glory into the holy city and the kingdom of beauty becomes the kingdom of Christ. Soul's self-fulfilling task in the world directed by the aims of Christ is a creation of beauty.

His beautiful has been obscured by his true and good. When recognized it has often been defined in terms of truth or goodness, as beauty is thus defined in some theories of æsthetics. What beauty is cannot be expressed in intellectual or in ethical terms. It is harmonious with truth and goodness. It unites with them in life symmetrically complete. It does this because it is an excellence in itself. It is not reducible to either or to both the others, therefore not definable by either or both of them.

To read the life and sayings of Jesus for their truth and goodness and not also with deep and ever new rapture in their beauty is to be deficient in appreciation of him. The responsive heart is moved as by haunting melodies, tremendous symphonies, poetry, drama and romance, exquisite pictures and sculptures, fine or noble architecture, delicate flowers and faces, nature's majesty and loveliness. All that we receive from them opens the heart to his graciousness which is imparted to them. Not all the beautiful things he said and did are in themselves sublime, though their place in his life's sublimity glorified them all. Dramatically artistic are his delineations of profligacy and luxury, of insensibility and hate. Hideous things touched him, but sublimely beautiful were his redemptive reactions. He unites in himself exquisite

beauties, consummate sublimities. Everything that is his creative fulfilment partakes his truth, his goodness and his beauty.

Of the artistries of Jesus it is possible to refer to only a few. All of them are essential to soul's self-fulfilling task. One is his harmonization of beauty with truth and goodness, while his beauty is none the less an excellence in itself. This harmonization belongs among the supreme æsthetic excellencies. By the measure of its achievement the great artists are estimated. Life complete in this harmonization, flawlessly expressed, was Jesus' artistic achievement, flawless because every detail is for the creation of the whole, and that complete.

Art is the representation of interiors. This is not an attempt at definition. There can be none. Statements in intellectual terms, which by their nature are inadequate here, are at best only intimations, as when one directs you to a path up the height from which you may view the sunset. The artist must be a realist, realist of interiors and of exteriors for their sake. A painter of portraits, and even of still life, must be that. No writing worthy to be called literature is less than that. Imagination is penetration. The demand for beauty is soul's demand for soul. Jesus the supreme realist leads us into the soul of flower and sky, of life and death, of human hearts and of the heart of God.

In Jesus is the beauty of simplicity. He goes directly to nature and human life, sees what is, unblurred by tradition and preconception. He tells just what he sees and nothing alien intrudes into the telling. His acts and his life have that simplicity. He never mingled things that do not belong together. In every combination, whether of words or deeds, or of both words and deeds, only the essentials are present, each in its intrinsic relations to the others, in a synthesis completely simple, in its simplicity

complete. His words and acts are inevitable. Not one could have been said or done by him differently. The additions and inventions of the evangelists are evident to an æsthetic criticism, which must be æsthetic to be accurate. The responses of his heart to nature and human life are inevitable responses. In him were flower and mountain, all natural and human beauty, flowing without break or impediment into and from his soul.

We recognize in Jesus qualities to which the Hellenic is not alien. What eminent critics have written in praise of the Hellenic artistic repose is applicable to him. By the canons of Greek art, which indeed are not exhaustive but are necessary for every æsthetic judgment in whatever new field, Jesus is supreme artist. He did not obtain them from the Greek æsthetic. He and the Hellenic masters of word and form derived them from beauty's pure springs. There is no reference in Jesus' recorded sayings to Hellenic artistic creations, which were present in Palestine and Decapolis, not unobserved by him who reflectively observed everything. He did not praise them in the presence of those to whom even the most discriminative praise would have been bewildering. Neither did he condemn them, though pagan, for that would have connoted a condemnation of their beauty. What other wise and great reserves were in the mind of the Master?

From degeneracies and depravities of artistic taste he leads us; from decadencies in literature, painting and every art; from the monstrosities and crude fads of our day. He is the poet's, the artist's Christ. He is the Christ of every latent artistry. By the path of beauty we come to him, guided along the path by the radiance of his words and deeds, his life and soul.

Thither he leads all men. For beauty is a social excellence. The heart in its consciousness of being too small

and weak to appropriate it demands the appreciation of others to manifold the receptive powers. And to impart is to receive. Nothing is beautiful which is not intrinsically of universal appeal. Therefore our impulse is to lead others to it and up into it and to be led by them. This social nature of beauty is especially evident in the sublimities and charms of lonely places. Though we can hardly endure the intrusions of the unreceptive, we long for the participation of a congenial soul. Therefore lovers seek these scenes together. In such receptions, even when one is alone, it is not an isolated self which is awed and glorified. We are conscious of the universal heart throbbing in us and we go back to men with a deepened impulse to reveal. So above all with our visions of the sublime loveliness of Christ. The social nature of beauty impels us to beautify the homes, the streets, the working-places and resorts of the people, to impart and create beauty everywhere, to drive out of the world not only sin, ignorance and misery, but also the ugliness, the deformities of human life. No great work of art has a fitting place except where all may see. It is deprived of an essential of its universality otherwise. By the same law the raptures of music must be made accessible to all. A barrier to beauty is an æsthetic offence, a profanation. To open the creations of beauty to all men, to flood life with beauty, this is an implication of our time, to be fulfilled by the aims of Christ.

To make life beautiful as Jesus' life was beautiful in its inclusive simplicity, its penetrations to soul, its harmonizations with truth and goodness, this is the consummation of beauty. It is not enough that there should be beautiful objects and seasons for their enjoyment. Nothing external or temporary is sufficient. Beauty must be pervasive of life. This cannot be unless truth and goodness are continuously active. We do not say that a life is

beautiful unless we recognize its integrity of truth, its goodness of holiness and love; but we reverence also a completive splendour. The life beautiful is the spring of beautiful creations. In humanity's life made beautiful is limitless artistic power.

Beauty cannot be accounted for mechanically. Any materialistic explanation tells only some of its conditions. It is not derivable from the world unless spirit is in the world. It is a spiritual immanence in soul which, when we penetrate its reality, is found to be an immanence of the eternal beauty in soul's self-fulfilling task in the world.

II

The true and the good are, with the beautiful, implicit in this endeavour. The impulse of our time is to seek them in human action rather than in any transcendent realm. Present intellectual and ethical tendencies, as well as the æsthetic, contain implications of soul's self-fulfilling task in the world.

Much that is regarded as new in the ethical, or unethical, movements of our time is not as new as it may seem. Former things appear in new aspects, which are not altogether new. We older boys and girls are not as much shocked and scandalized by the alleged innovations of youth as youth expects and desires. They do what we did and to a considerable extent continue to do. We danced and sang with their delight. Our loves and philanderings were under the same stars. The conventions which they defy were recognized in limited circles, were very limited there, and were continually evaded and broken through. The irrepressible vitality of modern youth, their follies and wisdoms, natural impulses and spiritual sanctities, were and still are ours, and ours their revolts and questionings. The new expressions, as far as

they are new, are evolutionary rather than revolutionary, though indeed in an emergent evolution. Our time's liberation of life is itself the evolution of the human spirit, working out and playing out its impulse to ever larger freedom. Advances along the path are essayed in the ineradicable adventureness of the soul.

The present dominant ethical tendencies are not determined by any one class of people. We are accustomed to judge other civilizations and earlier phases of our own by the powers and decadencies of the dominant classes. This is to neglect other forces of the past, which are stronger now. In America there is no dominant class. For the significance of the peculiarly significant economic movement is not in the concentrations but in the diffusions of wealth. In Europe the growth of a truly social democracy persists through the various fortunes of a political democracy which when pushed back recoils for stronger advances. And the world is becoming one in an irresistible popular tendency. There are leaders and repressers, but they are not of one social and economic class, nor do they tend to be. An estimate of the ethical implications of today must include all sorts and conditions of men. All sorts and conditions of men are receptive of one another, are participants generally in the tendencies of our time.

The American people—of the United States, Canada and those of the same spirit in other parts of the Western hemisphere—are especially representative of present movements. They are not as described by a number of foreign writers who have seen a little of the surface of them. It is important to observe that the economic advance by the scientific organization of industry has included multitudes in a participation new to them in the opportunities, enjoyments and values of life. That there should be among them confusions of values, uncertainties of aims,

is inevitable. As superficial as the judgment that the Athens of Paul's day was wholly given over to idolatry is the characterization of America as an aggregation of materialistic money-grabbers. The accusation is sufficiently refuted by educational conditions and the wide diffusion of the amenities of life. America is practically achieving for the many the goods that had been accessible to the few, by an economic advance that means freedom and scope of life. If in this process some of these goods are vulgarized, they unfold new excellencies and powers by being universalized. The determination of the people generally, from the learned to those who are learning, from the rich to those who are intent upon rising out of poverty, is to break away from past repressions, to win vital liberty. It is a resolve that may work for good or for evil, with opportunities of great good and of great evil. There is in it the implication of soul's self-fulfilling task in the world according to the aims of Christ.

The self-assertion of the individual is characteristic of our time. It thrives in an established democracy, political, social and we can also say economic, for the scientific organization of industry is toward economic democracy increasingly realized. Individuality of thought, of expression, of self-realization in one's works, pursuits, career, is the assertion of one's own life, of one's own soul. Self-realization is a watchword of our time and is the motive even of those who do not know that word. But it works to a personality receptive and impartive. Wholesome disciplines of it where independent people rub against one another are for realizations of its personal social nature. Life's salutary lesson, best learned in such a democracy, is that only as a man realizes himself can he fill his place among men, have something valuable to impart, and that he realizes himself by receptions from other men and impartations to them. The less solidaric, the more social:

the more social, the more personal. Repression of personality, one's own or of others, is social wrong.

Personally, socially, it is a time of revolt against conventions, of thought and belief, of conduct and institutions. The ecclesiastically and pedagogically minded try to stop the tide. They warn against the demoralizations incurred by this impulse. And it is true that it results in many ruined lives. Whether there are more of them than under the restrictions of the past, which were ineffective for multitudes, is in question. Whether the present demoralizations are greater, more pervasive than those of epochs which attempted to restrict human impulses by unvital standards is not proven. Every advance has its own perils. It brings new opportunities for mischief great and small, and these are also opportunities for good. There are people who hasten to construct new external forms, even as modernistic dogmatists substitute new creeds for old. But the revolt is not against this or that convention. It is against conventions as such. It is the refusal to be repressed by any externalities whatsoever.

All this concerns the negative aspect of the impulse. Its positive import is its demand for fulness of life. It is the claim that every human power be set at liberty. Many are the experiments that go wrong, disastrously explode. Many an assertion of liberty is a deeper bondage, lets in the world to dominate the soul. Many give themselves to that which is not completeness of life, not the liberty which is the harmonious working together of all vital powers. But it is futile to try to check the impulse by directing it back or by erecting new barriers. The vital flood sweeps on and sweeps away.

Yet our time is peculiarly conscious of inviolable law. Our science asserts it with innumerable applications that enforce it. The organizations of men's works and relations strengthen this consciousness, the more clearly as

these organizations become larger and more complex. For their very existence the nations and our civilization require law everywhere in the place of the old anarchies. All the progress and all the disasters of personal and social life bear witness to its necessity. And it is an ineradicable conviction of the human soul and essential to our very being. Here is the practical antinomy of our time: the invincible impulse to that liberty which is fulness of life, and the inevitable recognition of inviolable law. To say that liberty is under law is meaningless, for then it would not be liberty. To move within the length of one's tether is not to be free. Nor if law is in a relation which is expressible in external terms does law attain its spiritual sanctity. Both are then subject to mutual concessions and restrictions which thought cannot accept nor conduct act upon.

The law of the soul is not outside the soul, is the teaching of Christ's words and deeds and life. It is not prescriptive but immanent. It is not bondage but liberty. Nor is it a bondage under which there is a certain degree of freedom. This does not mean that each individual forms law from his individual self. The self is not so formed. Into itself it discriminatively receives the treasures of the past, the contributions of the present. It receives them into itself, makes them itself, even as Jesus discriminatively received. The vital principle of the discrimination is soul's fulness of life. Law is the fulfilment of soul in its task in the world. Law is social, of the personal social soul. Law is the fulness of the life which continuously enlarges and harmonizes itself in the development of all the energies of life in every man and in humanity. The knowledge of the world's processes is knowledge how to master them. Its forces are transformed into soul's power over them.

Law, whose other name is the good, is supreme, invio-

lable sanctity. It is not the sanctity of an abstract principle. It is a holy will of love, universal, eternal, immanent in the human soul. This, and nothing less than this, is our experience of the good, whenever we sound the depths of any moral experience, reverence the sanctity of any moral obligation. It is obeyed when we make it our own. The will of God does not connote an attribute of God. It is all God active, energizing, and acting and energizing in us. It is the will of the Father, which is the liberty of the glory of the children of God. We live and move and have our being in this living will of good. It is the will of the Father who imparts himself to us not from without, for fatherhood has its dwelling in the hearts of its children.

Law has its supreme principle, or rather its concrete realization and fulfilment that goes ever on. It is perfect simplicity, which is not the selection of one element which must then be somehow related to other elements. It is love's directive simplicity of the unity of all men together, of all men in the love which is the Father's life. God is love, and love alone is liberty.

This perfect law of Christ, which in a previous chapter we found to be soul's inmost being, the will of the Father, love's indissoluble life, learns and uses all that the world can furnish, all that the soul in its personal social task of self-fulfilment in the world can develop for love's work. Shall not love learn to relieve, bless and enrich those who are loved, master all things for its ministry in the world? It is creative of the human world of organizations, by which it realizes itself, realizes soul. It creates civilizations and their powers and instruments. But these organizations cannot dominate or repress the soul. They grow and change by soul's continuous construction and use of them, in harmonious developments of all human powers unto fulness of life, with inexhaustible unfoldings.

Thus the life of our time, in its impulse of liberty and its recognition of law, finds its antinomy resolved, unified, vitally fulfilled. Whether it will thus realize itself is its task, our task, to determine. Evident in our time is its implication of soul's work in the world according to the aims of Christ.

III

Concerning our time's fundamental thinking—the realm of truth—in its implications of soul's task in the world, our alternative might seem to be silence or an extended critical discussion of this vast complexity. But there are characteristics of present thought which are generally recognized though with great variety of interpretations. Their implications may be very briefly indicated.

The philosophy of our time is experimental, as is the life of our time. Its method is not the assumption of general principles from which reality is deduced. Mental processes are discovered experimentally, and their applications and therefore their validity are continually tested by experiment. "Radical empiricism" is at least a method employed by contemporary fundamental thinking generally, from its realistic to its idealistic varieties. Experiment is experience, and experience belongs to that persistency which, under whatever name or avoidance of name, is connoted by the word soul. Here the fundamental thinking of our time must be distinguished from scientific methods and processes which fundamental thinking interprets.

In contemporary thinking soul is not considered apart from the world but always as soul in the world, whatever the world may be, acting in the world and upon it, continuously affected by it. To whatever extent the soul may be understood to be formed from the world it is always regarded as soul in the world.

The action of soul in the world is not considered to be aimless. It is, even if supposed to be determined, regarded as somehow purposive. There is general acknowledgment that processes of thought are purposive. The word aims we have found to be more appropriate for this inclusive quality than the word ends, which might connote something exterior to the process. The question of what these aims are is unavoidable to any thinking that is complete, fundamental and really philosophical.

They are variously expressed, variously estimated. Some of the statements are not intended to be complete. Their authors are not to be criticized because they prescribed these limitations to themselves. A writer or teacher is not to be blamed because he did not attempt to do something else. If these parts are assumed to be the whole there is then ground for criticism. Those who take the larger view generally express the aims in terms of human welfare, whether they hold them to be within the aims of the universe, or only the concerns of an ephemeral, infinitesimal part of it. In either case contemporary philosophy, as the fundamental science of human welfare, generally asserts or implies human welfare as the harmonious development of the impulses and powers of men and of humanity in the world.

The fundamental thought of our day eagerly accepts the labours and discoveries of science, physical, psychological, social. Every scientific process eliminates whatever is not necessary to it. Otherwise it makes no contribution to life. What has been abstracted must in due time be restored; the result of the scientific process must be set into relations to that which has been excluded from the scientific process. Else life receives no contribution from science.

Our contemporary philosophy in its principal tendencies deals with the concrete. There is no truth nor good nor

beauty apart from those who think and act and feel. Their mutual relations are emphasized. They do all their living together, even in solitude. The philosophy of our time is social philosophy. Whether this concrete, experimental, experiential, purposive social view be anything other than the construction of soul's self-fulfilling task in the world is the question that confronts it.

The aims which must be considered in that inquiry cannot be accepted from any authority. They cannot be prescribed to us. But they can be presented, to be experimentally tested. If the aims of Christ, which are practical and eternal, are experimentally vindicated in the human welfare which they disclose, then to Christ belongs the supreme leadership of thought and life.

IV

When the implications of soul's task in the world are realized there is found the God of the task, the world, the soul. No demonstration of him is attempted here other than soul's experience of him in its task in the world.

What soul experiences in its personal social task is universal purpose which embraces all souls. As purpose it knows what it is working for, knows what it works with, knows itself. It is the will of God, not a divine attribute, but all God active, energizing. In this living God we trust, to him we pray.

The spiritual progress of mankind is the increasing consciousness of the mystery and the closeness of God. The more mysterious he is to us the closer do we feel his presence. For deeper than the mystery of the stars is the mystery of the soul. The more the soul discovers, achieves and develops itself in the world, so much the closer grows upon us the mystery of God, the more inexhaustible his eternal ways, which are ways of this fulfil-

ment of the soul. We do not limit him to that. No limitation is accordant with our adoration of his unfathomable mystery. Yet if we could know the vastness of the task, as inclusive of all souls in whatever spheres and phases now unimaginable, there might not be a limitation in accepting his revelation of himself as God of the task as his ultimate word. This is our God. He works with us and in us. His working is to unite all his children in the fulfilment of the soul of humanity, which is inclusive of them all, throughout all his world. The God of the soul in its task in the world is the God of the world in which that task is done, even as Jesus said: Father, Lord of heaven and earth.

Other ways of seeking God lead into this way. Every finding of him is consummation in this discovery.

It is indeed true that we find God in the solitudes of night and mountain, of thought, contemplation, prayer. The great spiritual leaders are prophets of the wilderness. There they received into their own souls the joys and sorrows, the deepest needs, the most pregnant aspirations of men, from him who loves them all. The finding of God in the wilderness was the reception of energies for their ministry. The experiences of the wilderness were in their soul's task in the world. So Jesus went into the mountain apart to pray and continued all night in prayer. He came down from those heights with deepened understanding of men, with reinforcements of that life which he poured along their lowly ways. Contemplative mysticism is for and in the ethically spiritual mysticism, which is God working in us. The soul's union with God is with the God of the task. There is no division of soul's life. All is its ministering self-fulfilment in the world.

On the heights of the true, the good and the beautiful men find God in whom are all truth, all goodness, all beauty. These are not mere concepts or abstractions.

They are living powers of the God of the task. They are real as soul's self-fulfilling task achieves them with him and in him.

God is found in the depths of the soul. If we do not find him there we do not find him anywhere. The procedures of science are restricted. The processes of dialectic thought answer us: From what principles shall he be deduced who is greater than they if he is at all? Or by what inductions shall we mount to him who is above their realm if he is at all? One has said in his name: Thou couldst not seek me if thou hadst not found me. When there is inward finding of him then thought and science become recognitions of him everywhere along his immeasurable ways. We are turned to the deeps of the soul to find God there. These are not motionless deeps. They are mighty surges of love, of bereavement, of heroic resolve. They are tides of life, of soul fulfilling itself in its task.

There is a vital truth which the principle of authority in religion perverts, materializes. Its logical working out to infallible papal pronouncements is a *reductio ad absurdum*. The light of criticism, no more to be shut out than sunlight from the earth, beats destructively upon them. Along with that authority every papacy of men and books and creeds is swept away. The alternative which the false principle asserts between authority in religion and isolated individualism is false to all experience. There are great and beautiful souls whom we revere, impartive of their faith, vision, devotion. There are life-giving words of theirs and inspirations beyond all words. Jesus and they are not prescriptive. They impose nothing upon us. Their impartations are of the freedom of the spirit, that we may be quickened by them to the experience of God in our own souls. What they express is universal in humanity. Together men seek God, together find him, together do his task in the world.

The God of the personal experience is the God of the social life because the task which is our inmost personal being extends as far as humanity extends. Our closest intimacies are of it and for it. Any limitation of them is loss of their intrinsic beauty, goodness, truth. Life's exquisite romance, perennial passion, ineffable blending of soul with soul, demands all that the wealth of human life can contribute to it. It fulfils itself in the task together, which is the life together. The larger the receptions and impartations of the task, the more inviolable are the sanctities. The wider the expansions, the more intense are the concentrations. So the soul that receives Christ by giving itself to him fulfils that union in the all-inclusive services which draw it closer to its Lord. So with every relation, interblending of the lives of men, in fatherhood and motherhood, in brotherhood and sisterhood, in friendships, which are partnerships of men who are drawn closer together, in clearer understandings of one another the more their task is for wider circles. Patriotism is genuine and practical for fulfilments of national life when the nation serves mankind's advance and in its ministry receives mankind. The personal life, intensifying with every social outpouring, concentrating itself by its impartations, is in and for humanity as far as humanity extends. Whatever souls are now beyond our sight, whether of future generations, our heirs, or those no longer perceptible through flesh and sense and whose work we continue, or natives of other spheres, children with us of the same Father, are within these receptive and impartive potencies. In this universal humanity every soul lives and has its being because it moves therein. So close and vast, so intense and universal in his love is the God of the task.

Here is exclusion of evil for inclusion of good. That which opposes the universal task of humanity is not of

it, has no part in it. Unconcessive are the separations of its life against that which seeks its death. Its war is waged in the confidence that that which is divided cannot stand against the united energies, that every sin in us shall be eliminated, and that not one soul, which as soul is indispensable to every other and to all in their life together, shall be lost to the humanity which seeks and saves the lost. Holy is its task. Its God is the holy God.

Unless we revert to the superstition that the soul is an inactive substance separable from its action, God's presence in our tasks is presence in our souls. God is not less personal because universally immanent. The more widely any soul receives other souls and humanity, and the more devotedly it imparts to other souls and humanity, the more intense is its personal concentration. That which is universally immanent is completely personal. We are strivings unto that complete personality. In God we find ourselves. In our prayers we call him Father. The passion of fatherhood, and from him every fatherhood in heaven and on earth is named, is the fulfilment of every one of its children in their life together, taking its children into its own life, imparting to them its own joy and power.

When we say, Oh that I knew where I might find him! the answer is right around us in our actual task. God is found in those places from which an irreligious inhumanity, not of Christ, would call us away, to look for God elsewhere. In human toils of farm and mine and household, of transportation by land and sea and air, in the whir of factory wheels, in the rush of a city's streets, in scientific organizations of industry, there we find him. We retire when we may, to view and grasp their significance, making these leisures essentials of our task, for the significance is there.

We trust that holy will of fatherhood for the hereafter

as well as for the mortal phase of life. There is no limit to the task and development of soul. This faith is a personal faith, since every unfolding of the task is the concentration of each soul, developing itself with others in the task whose hereafter is the hereafter of every participant. Faith in the life eternal is personal social faith, personal because social, social because personal. The developments of all are for each. Those of each are for all. And the life of each and all is in his life who is the God of the eternal task. As Jesus said: All live unto him.

No dialectic proof has been attempted of the spiritual nature of the soul, of God, of immortality. But when in the task of soul, thought reveals itself as universal thought of the universal mind, purpose as will of the eternal love, recognition is demonstration. Tests of reason applied to this experimental reality cannot as rational treat it as other than it is. Beauty, goodness, truth, Christ, humanity, and the Father who is the life of them all, these are eternal immanences in the loves that are deepest in our hearts and the works that are next our hands.

DATE DUE

BS 2417 .S7 D57 1930

Dickinson, Charles Henry,
1857-

The social aims of Jesus

230

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS2417.S7 D57 1930
Dickinson, Ch The social aims of Jesus /
3 0645 0005 2570 5